# DHVANYALOKA

Dr. K. GODA VARMA

DEPARTMENT OF MALAYALAM
UNIVERSITY OF KERALA
TRIVANDRUM

# DHVANYALOKA

## A Study on the First Udyota

# DHVANYALOKA

(A Study on the First Udyota)

**Dr. K. GODA VARMA**

Department of Malayalam
University of Kerala
Karyavattom 695 581

DHVANYALOKA
by
Dr. K. Goda Varma

Published by
Dr. V. S. Sharma
Professor & Head, Department of Malayalam
University of Kerala
Karyavattom 695 581

Distributed by
The Director of Publications
University of Kerala
Trivandrum 695 034

Printed at
The St. Joseph's Press
Cotton Hill, Trivandrum 695 014
March 1996

Copies Printed 1000
Price Rs. 40.00

## CONTENTS

# FOREWORD

Dr. K. Goda Varma (1902–1952) was born in the Kilimanur Palace which is famed for its cultural heritage. He took his Doctorate from England and served as Professor of Malayalam at Trivandrum. Dr. Varma was the Principal of the Sanskrit College for a short period. He died in harness while he was working as the Professor of Malayalam in the University College, Trivandrum. The noted Poet the late Changampuzha Krishna Pillai was one of his favourite students.

As a teacher, as a devoted Researcher and as a Scholar Dr. Vama did yeoman service in the field of linguistic and Literary studies in Malayalam. His monumental work 'Keralabhasha Vjnaniyam' is an anthetic reference book for every student of Malayalam Language and Litrature. His other major works 'Indo Aryan Loan Words in Malayalam', Utkrishta Prabandhangal, Vichara vichi, Kairali Darpanam, and Pabandha Kaumudi, etc. give clear evidence for the masterly mind of the author and his involvement in academic studies. His translations of 'Kadambari', 'Vasavadatha' and 'Pranaya vaichitryam' also prove the literary acumen of the author.

Dr. Varma married the daughter of Prof. A. R. Raja Raja Varma, an illustrious personality who has made an indelible impression in the minds of the students of Malayalam Language and Literature through his immortal contributions.

Shri. G. Ravindra Varma, Gandhian and Ex-Minister, son of Dr. Varma generously donated the collection of his father's books to the Departmental Library in 1992. I take this opportunity to express profound gratitude for his kind gesture. Among the books we received, there is a manuscript of Dr. Varma of his study on the book 'Dhvanyalokah' of Anandavardhana. It is limited to the first Udyota (Canto) alone. There are a number of studies on theory of Suggestion. Dr. Varma's manuscript is valuable addition to that wealth of Studies in Poeties. It will be

a befitting tribute to Dr. Varma himself when the University publishes the book.

As it is said above, this work is incomplete as such. Another matter to be pointed out here is that, phonetic script is not used and this limitation demands careful reading of the passages quoted in the text from the Sanskrit originals.

An appraisal or an evaluation of the work done by Dr. Goda Varma or on the Dhvani theory is not being attempted here. I am sure that this study because of its authenticity will benefit any student of aesthetics in the Indian context.

It is a matter of satisfaction and gratitude for the Kerala University, and especially for the Malayalam Department that it could bring out the undetected manuscript of the late Dr. Goda Varma in book form. Thanks are due to Shri. Ravindra Varma, and his cousin Prof. R. Prabhakara Varma. The St. Joseph's press which undertook the printing of the book also deserve mention here.

1-3-1996 V. S. Sharma

# DHVANYALOKA

## UDYOTA ONE

In the first Udyota the existence of Dhvani is established after a thorough refutation of the views entertained by the opposing schools of thought.

### 1. INVOCATION

Ananda Vardhana, the author of the commentary known as Aloka on the Karikas expounding Dhvani opens his work with a benedictory verse invoking Madhuripu (the foe of Madhu i.e., Vishnu).

Svacchasvacchayayasitendavah - The word Svaccha in the compound has, according to Locanakara, the meaning Svacchatagunah i.e. Nairmalyam. Although words like Svaccha-and Mrdu-are frequently employed to denote substances containing the qualities of Svacchyam, Mrdutvam, etc., their primary meanings are their respective qualities. Their non-primary sense as Tattadgunakadravyas is due to Padarthantarasamavaya or contact with the meanings of other words. cf. *Niladipadanam Nilarupadau Nilavisiste, ca Saktih kosena Vyutpadita, Tathapi Laghavad Niladaveva Saktih, Niladivisiste Tu Laksana*[1] and also *Svacchamrduprabhrtayo hi Mukhyataya Bhavavrttaya Eva.*[2] If Svacchasvacchaya - is construed as a Karmadharaya compound as Svaccha Ca Sa Svacchaya Ca it would only convey the sense of stainless lustre whereas if it is taken to be a Dvandva compound as Svacchasca Svacchaya Ca Svacchasvacchaye would yield both stainlessness and loveliness of shape of the claws.

1. Siddhanta-Muktavali
2. Locana

Ananda Vardhana the author of the commentary known as Aloka on the Karikas expounding Dhvani has fashioned the benedictory verse in such a way as to exemplify therein the threefold varieties of suggested sense viz. Rasadhvani, Vasthudhvani and Alankaradhvani whose detailed exposition forms the subject matter of the work. The expressions Madhuripu and Prapannarticchid suggest heroic sentiment since Utsaha (strenuous exertion) is implied through the delineation of Adhyavasaya (resoluteness) and Asammoha (non-perplexity) on the part of Madhuripu. By the word Svacchasvacchayayasitendavah is suggested the lack of lustre and attractiveness of the moon by the side of the claws. This is an instance of Vastudhvani. The epithet Prapannarticchidah given to the claws is suggestive of Vyatirekalankara in as much as it indicates that in spite of their both possessing resplendence and loveliness of shape of an identical character, the claws are superior to the moon by virtue of their competence to remove, unlike the moon, the miseries of those who seek their protection.

## 2. THREE DIFFERENT VIEWS ON DHVANI

In the Karika beginning with Kavyasyatma, three different views regarding the principle of Dhvani are referred to:–

Dhvaniriti-the word Samjnitah has to be understood as coming after Iti. The term Dhvani denotes the suggested sense which yields a far greater charm than that proceeding from the Vacyartha cf. *Dhvanyate Sabdavacyarthataya Adhikacamatkaritaya Pratiyate Yo ſ Rthah Sa Dhvanih.*[3]

Jagaduh. With the Lit form of the verb indicates that the Siddhantins had no occasion to hear even the fanciful arguments of the Abhavavadins who never ventured to give expression to their views and that the view points of the Abhavavadins are as such conjectural and without substance. cf. *Dhvanyabhavavadasya Sambhavanamatravisayataya Paramarthikasattvena Paroksasya Dyotako Jagaduh Iti Lit Prayoji.*[4]

3. Didhiti.

4. Didhiti.

Bhaktamahustamanye. The word Bhaktah is derived as Bhakteragatah i.e. that a sense which arises through Bhakti, a power capable of conveying another sense closely connected with the Abhidheya or expressed sense. The present form Ahuh points to the existence of the Bhakta theory since it has been frequently referred to by scholars and has some weight attached to it. cf. *Bhaktatvapaksasya Bahutropalambhat Saragarbhaprayatvacca Vidyamanatam Sucayitum Ahuh Iti Latprayogah.*[5]

Tena. Because there are such diverse opinions.

Three main features of Dhvani, the elaboration of which forms he subject matter of the work, are briefly indicated in the first Pada of the Karika, viz. (1) There exists a particular sense in poetical compositions which has won the commendation of scholars. (2) The same sense forms the soul of poetry. (3) It is known by the term Dhvani among the learned.

The explanation Kavyatattvavidbhih given to the word Budhaih by the Vrttikara is in keeping with the expression Kavyasyatma and is calculated to show that by the word Atma in the Karika is to be understood the sense of Tattvam. Dhvani, therefore, will be seen to form the crowning principle of poetry and is characterised by a loveliness which could not be conveyed by any other mode of expression.

Sahrdayajanamanahprakasamanasya. The fact that the scholars who are conversant with the truth of poetry have spoken in glorious terms about Dhvani is itself sufficient proof to its manifesting ever in the minds of men of taste and to its pre-eminence in poetry.

Api. The fatuity of the views of the Purvapaksins is made clear by the word Api. When the experience of men of taste bears testimony to Dhvani's existence, no weight can be attached to its negation.

The views of those who advocate the negation of the principle of Dhvani are pointed out in detail by the Vrttikara from the portion of the Vrtti beginning with Tadabhavavadinam and running up to Prakasayitum sakyam.

5. Didhiti.

Ami. That follow closely.

Vikalpah. Fanciful notions. cf. *Sabdajnananupati Vastusunyo Vikalpah.*[6]

Sambhavanti. Here means 'may arise' i.e the views of the Purvapaksins quoted are only conjectural.

Tatra. Among the Dhvanyabhavavadins.

Acaksiran. The use of Lin shows that the opinion to be set forth is mere supposition.

Sabdarthasariram. That which has Sabda and Artha for its body. Sabdo ƒrthasca sariram yasya tadrsam.

Tavat. Signifies the fact that Sabda and Artha constitute the body of Kavya has been accepted on all hands. cf. *Sabdarthau Sahitau Kavyam;*[7] *Sariram Tavadistarthavyavacchinna Padavali;*[8] *Kavyasabdoyam Gunalankarasamskrtayoh Sabdarthayorvartate. Bhaktya Tu Sabdarthamatravacanoƒtra Grhyate.*[9]

Tatra. In poetical composition.
Anuprasadayah. Sabdalankaras beginning with Anuprasa.

Upamadayah. Arthalankaras beginning with Upama.

Varnasamghatanadharmasca. It seems that the Locanakara has in his mind the reading Samghatanadharmasca only. cf. Locana. *Samghatanadharma Iti. Sabdarthayoriti Sesah.* The words Sabdagatah and Arthagatah have to be supplied from the previous sentences as qualifying Samghatanadharmah. It would then mean Sabdagatah Samghatanadharmah, Arthagatah Samghatanadharmasca i.e qualities producing Carutva resting upon either the proper combination of sounds or the proper combination of senses. Sounds and senses will thus be seen to have two different

6. Patanjali
7. Kavyalankara.
8. Kavyadarsa.
9. Kavyalankarasutra. See the Vrtti under the Sutra "Kavyam Grahyamalankarat."

kinds of loveliness one depending upon form and the other depending upon combination. Alankaras are factors producing Carutva of the former type while Gunas belong to the latter category. cf. *Dvividham Carutvam. Svarupamatranistham Samghatanasritanca. Tatra Sabdanam Svarupamatrakrtam Carutvam Sabdalankarebhyah Samghatanasritam Tu Sabdagunebhyah. Evamarthanam Carutvam Svarupamatranistham Upamadibhyah. Samghatanaparyavasitam Tvarthagunebhyah.*[10] All editions read Varnasamghatanadharmasca as the text of the Vrtti instead of Samghatanadharmasca, the reading familiar to Locanakara. The meaning given by Didhitikara to Varnasamghatanadharmasca is *Varnanam Sarthakanam Anarthakanancaksaranam, Samghatananam Samdrbdhasabdananca* (*Madhuryadivyanjakataya*) *Dharmah* (*Vyangyavyanjakabhavena*) *Vrttimantah.* It will be seen that Didhitikara interprets that Dharmas are of two kinds, namely Varnadharmas and Samghatanadharmas or Samdrbdhasabdadharmas which goes against the view of Locanakara to the effect that both the Dharmas depend upon Samghatana or combination.

Madhuryadayah. Qualities beginning with Madhurya. It may be noted that Bhamaha enumerates three qualities in composition, namely Madhurya, Prasada and Ojas.[11] Dandin speaks of ten qualities[12] all of which have been alluded to in the Natyasastra. They are Arthavyakti (perspicuity), Prasada (clearness), Slesa (firm structure), Madhurya (sweetness), Sukumarata (gentleness), Samata (evenness), Ojas (strength), Udaratva (elevation), Kanti (grace) and Samadhi (metaphorical expression). Vamana also mentions ten qualities. cf. Ojahprasadaslesasamatasamadhimadhuryasaukumaryodaratarthavyaktikantayo Bandhagunah.[13] According to Vamana, all the ten qualities could occur with reference to sounds as well as senses.

Tadanatiriktavrttayah. The pronoun Tad-refers to Alankaras and Samghatanadharmas previously mentioned. The whole word is an adjective qualifying both Vrttis and Ritis. In the case of

10. Locana.
11. Kavyalankara.
12. Kavyadarsa.
13. Kavyalankarasutra.

Vrttis Tadanatiriktavrttayah would mean not existing outside the field of Alankaras. Vrttis are only varieties of Anuprasa and as such can be regarded as ranging themselves under Sabdalankaras.

Vrttayah. The word Vrttayah is derived as Vartante Anuprasabhedah Asu Iti.

Kaiscit. By scholars like Bhattodbhata.

Upanagarikadyah. Beginning with Upanagarika. Udbhata has given three Vrttis namely Parusa, Upanagarika and Gramya otherwise known as Komala. Locanakara when commenting upon Upanagarikadyah etc. of the Aloka refers to the three Vrttis as Parusanuprasa Nagarika, Masrnanuprasa Upanagarika (Lalitanagarikaya Vidagdhaya Upamiteti Krtva) and Madhyamam Komalam (Aparusamityarthah). Of these the first is termed Nagarika because it is likened to a city girl who wears garments and ornaments of bright colours. cf. *Diptavesanagarikanganasadrsyannagariketi Gauniyam Samjna.*[14] The term Upanagarika is justified by the Vrtti being possessed of Lalitya which is characteristic of women similar to Nagarikas. cf. *Lalita Nagarikaya Vidagdhaya Upamiteti Krtva;*[15] and *Lalita Parusyaparipanthidhuryamadhuryasahita Tata Eva Tatsamjnita Bhavati.... Lalityameva Tatsamyamiti Bhavah.*[16] Gramya is termed so because the Vrtti is like a country girl who is devoid of harshness or sweetness of extreme degrees. For the same reason Locanakara attributes Madhyamatva to it. cf. *Vaidagdhyavihinasvabhavasukumara Parusagramyavanitasadrsyad Iyam Vrttirgramyeti;*[17] and *Parusyamadhuryavihinataya Tadubhayatatasthyam Iha Madhyamatvam Vivaksitam.*[18] The three varieties of Anuprasa are differentiated by Parusatva (harshness), Lalitatva (elegance) and Madhyamatva or Komalatva (an intermediate condition or tenderness) of the consonants employed with a view to fit in with the nature of the subject matter dealt with. When sentiments

14. Kaumudi
15. Locana
16. Kaumudi
17. Locana
18. Kaumudi

like Raudra are suggested, Parusaksaraprasa or Nagarikavrtti is resorted to. In depicting Srngara etc. Vibhavadis have to be delineated by employing sounds which are pleasing to hear i.e. through Upanagarikavrtti or Lalitanuprasa. In Hasya etc. Anuprasa of an intermediate character Madhyama (Gramyavrtti or Komalanuprasa) has to be made use of.

Ritayah. Tadanatiriktavrttayah has to be taken as an adjective of Ritayah from the previous sentence. The antecedent of Tad-is Samghatanadharmah.

Vaidarbhiprabhrtayah. The words Gatah Sravanagocaram has to be understood as coming after Vaidarbhiprabhrtayah. The form of the whole sentence being Tadanatiriktavrttayo Ritayasca Yah Kaiscid Vaidarbhiprabhrtayah Prakasitah, Ta Api Gatah Sravanagocaram. Ritis are but Gunas that have entered into close union superimposed on Vrttis or combinations of sounds suited to the brilliancy, grace or moderateness of the subject matter dealt with so as to form compact wholes. What results out of the superimposition of Gunas on the Vrttis is different from the Gunas themselves as a beverage prepared by mixing treacle, black pepper etc. is separate from its constituents. The Ritis are three in number and are known as Vaidarbhi, Gaudi and Pancali, the names being based upon the popularity they have gained with the poets of Vidarbha, Gauda and Pancala countries respectively.[19] Sameness of character between Vrttis and Vrttyanuprasas, and Ritis and Gunas is recognised on the assumption Jati and Samudaya are not different from Jatimat and Samudayin respectively.

Tadvyatiriktah. Different from them i.e. Sabda, Artha, Alankara and Samghatanadharma.

The contention is that there is no factor in a Kavya other than those enumerated above. If Dhvani is said to be the abode of Carutva, it can be brought under Sabda and Artha. Should it be considered as a factor producing Carutva, it will not be different from Alankaras or Gunas.

Ko ſ yam Dhvanirnama. Since there is no factor other than Sabda and Artha as the abode of Carutva and there is no factor

19. Kavyalankarasutra.

other than Alankaras and Gunas as producers of Carutva, the principle of Dhvani set forth by the new school which propounds it to be different from words, senses, figures of speech and qualities pertaining to the combination of sounds and senses, is inconceivable.

The second set of Abhavavadins argues:– "If there is a principle called Dhvani over and above the factors enumerated by the ancient rhetoricians, there will be no Kavyatva with regard to it. Since the acceptance of Dhvani would lead to the contingency of overhauling the definition of Kavya as given by scholars of old, the best way to get over it will be the rejection of such a principle."

Anye. Other set of Abhavavadins.

Prasiddhaprasthanavyatirekinah Kavyaprakarasya. The well-known system is the one that has been established by former rhetoricians as comprising Sabda, Artha, Guna and Alankara. That kind of Kavya the Siddhantin advocates, can, therefore, only take its stand outside the province of Kavya as conceived herebefore.

Kavyatvahaneh. A Kavya based upon the new principle of Dhvani will certainly be devoid of Kavyatva.

Sahrdaya............laksanam. The definition of Kavya that has gained acceptance is "Sahrdayahrdayahladisabdarthamayatvam". Note that Mayat here is Svarthika as in Cinmayam Brahma.

Na Cokta ............... Sambhavati. Margasya means of any system. Tad refers to Kavyalaksanam. Anything which does not range itself under the said system as Nrtta, Gita, Aksinikocana etc. is not regarded as possessing Kavyatva by anybody. In a similar manner, it will be seen that the definition of Kavya is not applicable to Dhvani which does not come under Sabda, Artha or the factors producing Sahrdayahrdayahlada namely Alankaras and Gunas.

Tadsamayantahpatinah. Those who recognise the principle of Dhvani.

Sahrdayan Kamscit Parikalpya. Supposing a few people wedded to the theory of Dhvani as men of taste in order that the position of the Dhvanivadins may be strengthened.

The idea of the text beginning with Na Ca Tatsamayantahpatinah and ending with Avalambate is:– "If the Siddhantins contend that the principle of Dhvani newly set forth possesses Kavyatva by reason of its being calculated to produce delight in the minds of a few, it has to be said that no weight can be attached to the view. For Dhvani is only an assumption having no substance behind it in as much as it does not appeal to true Sahrdayas. It is for a thing which really exists that definition is required and not for a thing which exists only in imagination of people of week discernment".

What follows is the view of the third set of Abhavavadins who hold that there cannot be established any Apurvatva or unprecededness with regard to Dhvani which does not transgress the domain of loveliness. For factors producing loveliness have already been recounted and Dhvani also must be one among them. Thus by denying the Apurvatva of Dhvani, its existence as a separate factor in poetry also is contradicted.

Apurvah Kascit. A principle unconceived and undefined hithertofore.

Kamaniyakam. Is derived as Kamaniyasya Karma and means the Hetuta (causativeness) with regard to the perception of loveliness in poetry.

Tesam...... syat. Dhvani cannot be put down to be characterised by unprecededness merely by being said to be the name of one among the producers of Carutva.

The Vrtti beginning with Kinca and ending with Sruyate refutes Dhvani after admitting it for the sake of argument.

Vagvikalpanam. Of varieties of beauty in respect to words, senses and the connotational power of words. cf. *Vaktiti Vak Sabdah, Ucyate Iti Vagarthah, Ucyate Naya Iti Vagabhidhavyaparah.*[20]

Prasiddhaih. By renowned scholars like Udbhata.

20. Locana

Prakaralese. In respect to a minor variety of either Gunas or Alankaras.

Anyaih. By Bhamaha, Dandin, Vamana etc.

Tesam. With regard to those who have brought to light numerous varieties of Alankaras.

Esa Dasa. Such a state of haughtiness and desire to be extolled by others. Didhitikara interprets Tesamesa Dasha as "Tesam Alankaraprakaranam Esha Dasa Nitaram Aprasiddhih" so as to fit in with the Atattvikaprakaratva of Dhvani which is, according to him, the point pressed in the argument of the Purvapaksin. It may also be noted that Vikalpanam in Vagvikalpanam is explained by him as Atattvikaprakaranam.

Tasmat. On the strength of the arguments advanced by all the three sets of Abhavavadins, viz. (1) Dhvani is not different from Alankara and Guna being a factor producing loveliness. (2) Dhvani is not a producer of loveliness being different from Alankara and Guna. (3) Even supposing that there is Dhvani and that it is a producer of loveliness, it does not deserve to be recognised as a factor of any great importance since it (Dhvani) admits of being considered as a minor variety of Alankara or Guna.

Anyena. By the poet Manoratha, a contemporary of the author.

Yasminnasti............Dhvaneh;-

Salankrti. Possessed of Alankaras. Note that by Alankaras here are meant only Arthalankaras.

Vyutpannaivacanaih. By words arising with variegation i.e, possessing Sabdalankaras.

Vakroktisunyam. Devoid of Vakrokti. Locanakara explains the word as:- "Devoid of the eminent quality of combination respecting sounds and senses, i.e. not containing Sabdagunas and Arthagunas." Although certain commentators have interpreted Vakrokti in the sense of skill in speech and thereby said that the word Vakroktisunyam points to the lack of Alankarasamanyalaksana which would amount to the total absence of Alankaras,

Locanakara rejects their view on the ground that it would lead to the Paunaruktya or the needless repetition of the same thing in different words.[21] It may however be noted that Bhamaha mentions Vakrokti as poet's skill in speech forming the fundamental constituent of all figures of speech. cf. *Saisa Sarvaiva Vakroktiranayartho Vibhavyate Yatnosyam Kavina Karyah Ko f Lankaro Naya Vina*[22] and *Vakrabhidheyasabdoktirista Vacamalankrtih.*[23] it seems quite probable the writer of the verse had in his mind the Indirect mode of expression constituting the special peculiarity of all Alankaras alluded to by Bhamaha. Alankaras are obviously different from Vakrokti although the latter enters into the constitution of all figures of speech. Hence the redundancy apprehended by Locanakara can be got over. Perhaps the adjective Manahprahladi over and above Salankrti employed with reference to Vastu shows also the Arthagunayuktatva of Vastu and the epithet Vyutpannaih qualifying Vacanaih denotes the Sabdalankarayuktatva as well as Sabdagunayuktatva of the sounds. In this way the criticism *Gunadyabhavanuktidosascatiricyate*[24] put forward by Kaumudikara also can be controverted.

The second of the three main views entertained by the opposing schools of thought is set forth in the Vrtti under Bhaktamahustamanye.

The second of the three main views entertained by the opposing schools of thought is set forth in the Vrtti under Bhaktamahustamanye.

The Bhaktatvavadins hold that Dhvani is the same as Bhakta or a sense got through Bhakti. The meaning of the word Bhakti has been pointed out in four different ways : (1) *Bhajyate iti Bhaktih* cf. *Bhajyate Sevyate Padarthena Prasiddhatayotpreksyate Iti Bhaktirdharmo – bhidheyena Samipyadih.*[25] Bhakti denotes relations like nearness. For example it is the nearness of the Tata

21. Locana
22. Kavyalankara
23. Kavyalankara
24. Kaumudi
25. Locana

to the Gangapravaha that is at the bottom of the usage Gangayam Ghosah in the sense of Gangatate Ghosah. It is the relation of Samipya to the Abhidheya i.e. Pravaharupa Ganga subsisting in Tata that makes us interpret Gangayam as Gangatate. Thus the sense got through Bhakti would include all kinds of Laksanikarthas proceeding through the different relations as nearness, similarity, inseparable concomittance, contrarity and connection with the action enumerated as being the bases of five kinds of secondary senses. cf. *Abhidheyena Samipyat Sarupyat Samavayatah Vaiparityat Kriyagaliaksana Pangadha Mata.*[26] (2)*Bhago Bhaktih* cf. *Gunasamudayavrtteh Sabdasyarthabhagastaiksnyadirbhaktih*[27] i.e. a particular aspect of the sense of a word implying several qualities, An instance is Simho Manavakah in which there are several qualities as Saurya, Pancasyatva, Mrgendratva etc. constituting the sense of the word Simha. The comparison intended between the lion and the youth is only with regard to one of the qualities namely Taiksnya. Simho Manavakah will therefore mean Manavaka is valient. Since Simha gives the meaning valient through a Guna or quality, the sense got through Bhakti will be seen to include Gaunartha. (3) *Bhajanam Bhaktih Sraddhatisayah* cf. *Bhaktih Pratipadye Samipyataiksnyadau Sraddhatisayah*[28] i.e. Bhakti is excessive attentiveness with regard to Samipya, Taiksnya etc. which are intended to be conveyed. Bhakta would thus embrace the Gaunartha as well as the Laksanikartha. Note that this interpretation is more comprehensive. For the irrelevancy of the criticism of Kaumudikara on the reading Samipyataiksnyadau adopted in the Locana refer Upalocana.[29] (4) *Bhango Bhaktih* cf. *Mukhyasya Carthasya Bhango Bhaktih*[30] i.e. Bhakti is the frustration of the Mukhyartha or the primary sense. In this sense, the word is to be traced to the root *Bhanjo Amarde*. In expressions like Gangayam Ghosah and Simho Manavakah there is Bhanga of the primary senses of the words Ganga and Simha, in as much as Gangapravaha cannot be the Adhikarana of Ghosa and correlation

26. Locana
27. Locana
28. Locana
29. Dhvanyaloka edited by Kuppuswami Sastri
30. Locana

(Samanadhikaranya) is impossible to be established between Simhatva and Manavakatva.

It will be observed from what has been stated above that by Bhakti are to be understood the three essential requisites of all kinds of figurative application (Upacara) namely Mukhyarthabadha, Nimitta and Prayojana. To illustrate, in Gangayam Ghosah there is incompatibility of the Pravaharupamukhyartha, there is Nimitta in the form of Samipya and there is Prayojana in the form of excessive attentiveness with regard to Samipya intended to be indicated. Similarly in Simho Manavakah there is inapplicability of the primary sense, there is Nimitta in the form of Sarupya and there is Prayojana in the form of Sraddhatisaya with regard to Taiksnya intended to be expressed.

Gunavrttih. A sense brought into existence through qualities like Samipya, Sarupya, etc. The word is to be derived as Gunaih (Samipyadibhih) Sabdasya (Gangadisabdasya) Yasmin Arthantare (Tiradau) Vrttih (Vartanam) Sah (Tiradyarthah) Gunavrttih. Although Gunavrtti in the text refers to the sense, the word admits of being interpreted as Sabda and Vyapara as well. Gunaih Arthantare Vartanam Yasya (Sabdasya) Sah Gunavrttih (Sabdah) and Gunain Arthantare Vartanam Sabdasya Yena (Vyaparena) Sah Gunavrttih (Amukhyah Abhidhavyaparah). The contention of the Purcapaksin is that Dhvani whether as Sabda (Dhvanatiti Dhvanih) or as Artha (Dhvanyate Iti Dhvanih) or as Vyapara (Dhvananam Iti Dhvanih) is not different from Gunavrtti i.e. Upacaritasabda, Upacaritartha and Upacaritavyapara. They therefore argue that there is no use of accepting a new principle called Dhvani when the purpose of the saying is already served by Gunavrtti. And when once Dhvani is established to be identical with Gunavrtti which could be inferred as being brought into manifestation by the force of a non-principal Abhidhavyapara, Bhaktatva or the non-principal character of Dhvani could also be easily perceived.

Next is cited the authority in support of the contention that Dhvani is identical with Gunavrtti. It is true that there is no explicit reference to the effect that Dhvani is not different from Gunavrtti in the works of the ancient rhetoricians. Nevertheless evidences are available enabling us to infer their sameness.

Kavyalaksanavidhayibhih. By Bhamaha and others.

Anyah. Other than Gunavrtti, i.e. in the form of Gunalankaradi.

Amukhyavrttya............... Darsayata. Locanakara explains Darsayata as Bhattodbhatavamanadina.[31] Uses of expression in which the non-principal Abhidhavyapara has its play have been pointed out by Bhattodbhata and Vamana in the passages *Sabdanam Abhidhanam Abhidhavyaparo Mukhyo Gunavrttisca*[32] and *Sadrsyallaksana Vakroktih*[33] respectively. Of these the former occurs by way of elucidation of the word Abhidhana in *Sabdacchandobhidhanartha Itihasasrayah Kathah Loko Yuktih Kalasceti Mantavyah Kavyagairhyami* of Bhamaha.[34] Vamana in the Sutra *Sadrsyallaksana Vakroktih* speaks about terms of expressions in understanding the meaning of which a non-principal Abhidhavyapara has to be resorted to, the only difference between him and Udbhata consisting in that he (Vamana) designates the Vyapara by the term Laksana. Laksana based upon similarity according to Vamanal produces the figure of speech known as Vakrokti. It will thus be seen that Amukhyavrtti of a particular type is being referred to by Vamana as an Alankara (Vakrokti). The fact that usages in poetry have been accounted for only through the workings of principa Abhidhavyapara or non-principal Abhidhavyapara coupled with the absence of any reference to Dhvani in the ancient works on rhetoric goes to tell that Bhamaha and others were rather inclined to consider that the principles contained in Dhvani were not in any way beyond the scope of Gunavrtti.

*Manak Sprsta Iti Parikalpya.* Three other readings are also found for this portion of the Vrtti. They are: (1) *Manak Sprstopi Na Laksita Iti Parikalpya.*[35] (2) *Manak Sprstopi Na Laksyata Iti Parikalpya.*[36] (3) *Manak Sprsto Laksyata Iti Parikalpya.*[37] Of

31. Locana
32. Locana
33. Kavyalankarasutra
34. Kavyalankara
35. Dhvanyaloka, Kasi Sanskrit series, 135
36. Dhvanyaloka, edited by Kuppuswami Sastri
37. Dhvanyaloka, Kavyamala series 25

these the first two will be seen to give the same meaning. These two readings appear to have been based upon the portion *Yathalikhitapathakaistu Svarupavivekam Kartum Asaknuvadbhistatsvarupaviveko Na Krtah, Pratyutopalabhyate, Abhagnanarikelavat Yathasrutatadgranthodgrahana matreneti* coming after *Taistavadhvanidigunmilita*[38] given by way of explanation of the word *Manaksprstah* of the Aloka. The interpretation given by those who favour the reading *Manaksprstopi Na Laksyate* or *Laksitah* may be stated thus:- "Although no Gunavrtti or any other factor has been pointed out with the expressed designation of Dhvani by the rhetoricians of old, on the strength of the fact that they have slightly hinted the principle of Dhvani and at the same time have given no detailed exposition of it, the Purvapaksa, to the effect that Dhvani is the same as Bhakta, has been raised by the Siddhantin. The word Yathalikhitapathakaih etc. of the Locana will accordingly refer to Udbhata and others who failed to make any serious notice of Dhvani in the passages as

*Unmimila Kamalam Sarasinam*
*Kairavam Ca Nimimila Muhurtat*[39]

cited to illustrate Gunavrtti. It cannot be said that they were unacquainted with Dhvani, for what they have quoted are obviously instances of Dhvanikavya. Their not having given any definition of Dhvani coupled with their indifference towards that principle in so far as they have failed to make any observation with regard to the same distinctly points to Dhvani being regarded by them as identical with Gunavrtti. Na Laksyate in the Aloka has to be explained as *Na Laksanena Vivicya Pratipadyate Vivecaniyo f pi Dhvanih*[40] as per the above view.

It may be observed that *Yathalikhitapathakaistu* etc. occurring in the Locana appears to be only an amplification of the idea contained in *Taistavaddhvanidigunmilita.* As such, it is doubtful whether it is an explanation of *Na Laksyate* in the Vrtti as construed by some. It is possible that *Yathalikhitapathakaistu* etc. refers to

38. Locana
39. Kavyalankarasarasangraha
40. Dhvanyaloka, edited by Kuppuswami Sastri

critics of weak discernment who are unable to think out on the lines indicated by Udbhata and others. The indication is of course to be found in the lines *Sabdanam Abhidhanam Abhidhavyaparo Mukhyo Gunavrttisca* and *Sadrsyallaksana Vakroktih* already referred to.

The third reading *Manak Sprsto Laksyata Iti Parikalpya* yields the same sense as arising from *Manak Sprsta Iti Parikalpya* which has been followed in the translation. Laksyate means Drsyate.

Another view put forward by some against the theory of Dhvani is next related. They hold the nature of Dhvani is impossible to be expressed by words and that it could be cognised only by the minds of men of taste.

*Laksanakaranasalinabuddhayah.* Locanakara gives the meaning *Apragalbhamatayah* to *Salinabuddhayah* i.e. people not having the necessary intelligence. It may be noted the people referred to here are those who are incapable of giving a proper definition to a thing which is believed by them to be actually existing, in so far as they themselves feel in their heart of hearts, that there is a sense which stands beyond the field of meanings conveyed by Abhidha or Laksana. The Siddhantin has also suggested herein that the opinion set forth by this school of thought is the result of ignorance and that as such it could easily be contradicted.

*Tenaivamvidhasu Vimatisu Sthitasu.* Evamvidhasu Vimatisu Sthitasu appears to have been put in by the Alokakara by way of bringing out disrespect towards the opposing schools of thought. Locanakara construes *Evamvidhasu Vimatisu Sthitasu* as *Nirdharane Saptami* and considers *Tena* as particularising the three opposing opinions referred to. cf. *Evamvidhasu Vimatisviti Nirdharane Saptami Asu Madhye Ekopi Yo Vimatiprakarastenaiva Hetuna.*[41] The antecedent of *Tena* is the total sense arising from the three Padas of the Karika, and not the opposing views. *Tena* would therefore mean 'out of respect for the upholders of Dhvani and with a view to silencing the opposing schools of thought.' The contempt of the adverse opinions implied thus in *Tena* is only amplified by

41. Locana.

*Evam vidhasu Vimatisu Sthitasu.* It is to be noted that the Locative here is not Nirdharane Saptami but Anadare Saptami. Disrespect can be denoted by the Locative also. cf. *Sasthi Canadare* (Panini 2-3-38) *Anadaradhike Bhavalaksane Sasthisaptamyau Stah.*[42] The form of the Anadarartha may be explained as *Evamvidhah Vimatayah* (Yah) *Sthitah* (*Tah*) *Anadrtya.* By the Anadara expressed with regard to the counter-opinions, the author's zealous devotion to the Dhvani school is evidenced. Hence the relevancy of a discussion of the nature of Dhvani is obvious.

*Tasya Hi Dhvaneh.........Vyavaharam.* Elucidates the word *Tatsvarupam* of the Karika. The nature of Dhvani generally pointed out in this connection will seen to be amply calculated to justify an undertaking of its exposition. The attributes given to Dhvanisvarupa each have the distinct aim of controverting the views brought forward by the various schools of opposing thought. (1) The word *Sakalasatkavikavyopanisadbhutam* refutes the Purvapaksas that Dhvani is only a Prakaralesa and that Dhvani is only an unnecessary new designation given to one of the factors already brought to light. For a thing which is Sakalasatkavikavyopanisadbhuta cannot be said to form a minor variety of one of the factors in poetry nor can it be argued to be devoid of any Apurvatva since it is a secret doctrine held in estimation by all good poets (2) The word *Atiramaniyam* shows that the delight accruing from Gunavrtti, Alankara, etc. cannot stand in any way on a par with the transcendental bliss resulting from Dhvani. The Siddhantin has contradicted here the Bhaktatva and the Gunalankaraantarbhutatva of Dhvani (3) The word *Anunmilitapurvam* suggests the newness of Dhvani since it has not been touched by the ancient rhetoricians. Dhvani cannot, therefore, be regarded as coming under any one of the factors enumerated hithertofore (4) *Ramayana ......... Vyavaharam* indicates the celibrity of Dhvani by reason of its having been universally employed in all instances of Uttamakavyas. In the existence of Laksya in any number, the non-existence of Dhvani cannot be argued simply because no definition of the same has been attempted. The Purvapaksa that the theory of Dhvani is based upon the publicity it has gained among a few supposed

42. Siddhantakaumudi

Sahrdayas and is not therefore of any substance also stands disapproved.

*Laksayatam.* Of those who scrutinise the nature of Dhvani in the light of its advanced definition. cf. *Laksanadvarena Nirupayatam.*[43] By Laksayatam the possibility of Laksanakarana is pointed out and the third Purvapaksa that Dhvani is beyond the description of words, is also generally met.

*Sahrdayanamanando ............Pratistham Iti.* This portion of the Vrtti is explanatory of *Sahrdayamanahpritaye* of the Karika and acquaints us with the purpose of Dhvanisvarupanirupana, the author proposes to attempt.

Persons of the following description are conceived by Locanakara as Sahrdayas or men of taste. "*Yesam Kavyanusilanabhyasavasad Visadibhute Manomukure Varnaniyatanmayibhavanayogyata Te Svahrdayasamvadabhajah Sahrdayah.*"[44]

*Prakasyate,* has for its object Dhvanisvarupam, the connection being *Maya Dhvanisvarupam Prakasyate.*

In *Sahrdayanamanando Manasi Labhatam Pratistham,* Locanakara thinks that there is an indication of the author's name and also a wish on the part of the author that his name may be cherished in the hearts of generations of men of taste to come. cf. *Ananda Iti Ca Granthakrto Nama Tena Sa Anandavardhanacaryah Etacchastradvarena Sahrdayahrdayesu Pratistham Devatayatanadivadanasvarim Sthitim Labhatam Gacchatviti Bhavah.*[45]

The last Pada of the Karika "*Tena Brumah Sahrdayamanahpritaye Tatsvarupam*" indicates the Anubandhacatustaya or the fourfold bindings viz. Visaya (subject matter), Prayojana (purpose), Sambandha (relation) and Adhikarin (the person entitled to undertake the study of the Sastra). The Visaya is Dhvanisvarupam; the Prayojana is Manahpritih; the Sambandha between the work and the subject matter is Abhidhanabhidheyabhavah, i.e. the

43. Locana.
44. Locana.
45. Locana

relation of expression and that which is to be expressed; and the Adhikarin is Sahrdaya. Should Dhvanisvarupajnana be taken as Prayojana, then Manahpriti has to be regarded as the Prayojana-prayojana or the supreme purpose. The relation between the purpose (Manahpritih) and the work is Sadhyasadhanabhavah. When Dhvanisvarupajnana is regarded as the Prayojana, the relation it bears to the work should be understood as Vyutpadyavyutpadakabhavah.

## 3. SUGGESTED SENSE AS DISTINGUISHED FROM EXPRESSED SENSE

*Bhumikam Racayitum.* Just as in erecting any edifice it is essential to lay at first a basement, it becomes necessary when the definition of Dhvani is attempted, to explain the principle on which it rests. The establishment of the existence of suggested sense as distinct from expressed sense forms the basis on which the theory of Dhvani is built up.

*Yo rthah Sahrdayaslaghyah ......... Smrtau.* This Karika attempts an analysis of Artha (sense) conceived as the soul of poetry by the earlier rhetoricians. Although both Sabda and Artha have been observed to be the constituents of poetry, the Artha which wins the approbation of men of taste appears to have been generally accepted as the soul of poetry. For the conception of a Sarira would naturally lead to the assumption of a soul and of Sabda and Artha, it is only Artha that deserves to be likened to the soul. cf. *Sabdarthasariram Tavat Kavyam Iti Yaduktam, Tatra Sariragrahanadeva Kenacidatmana Tadanupranakena Bhavyameva. Tatra Sabdastavaccharirabhaga eva Sannivisate Sarvajanasamvedyadharmatvat Sthulakrsadivat. Arthah Punah Sakalajanasamvedyo Na Bhavati.*[46] Thus it is to be understood that Artha has been shown to be the determinant of poetry in definitions like *Sabdarthau, Sahitau Kavyam,*[47] *Sariram Tavadistarthavyavacchinna Padavali*[48] etc. The Aloka itself will be seen to refer to views like *Sabdarthasariram*

46. Locana.
47. Bhamaha, Kavyalankara.
48. Dandin, Kavyadarsa.

*Tavat Kavyam, Sahrdayahrdayahladisabdarthamayatvameva Kavya-laksanam.* etc. to the same purpose. What the Dhvanikara wishes to point out is that the Sahrdayaslaghyartha constituting the soul of poetry will on a careful investigation show as falling into two distinct divisions, the expressed and the suggested. Locanakara construes the word Sahrdayaslaghyah qualifying Artha as the Hetu for the particular Artha being regarded as the sould of poetry. Hence Yo rthah Sahrdayaslaghyah would, according to him, be only the Pratiyamanartha. To escape the apparent discrepancy in the latter half of the Karika wherein it is said that the same Artha is of two kinds, viz. Vacya and Pratiyamana, Locanakara would explain Tasya as referring to Artha generally which is conceived as being of a single kind only by people of weak discernment and that the antecedent of Tasya is not the Sahrdayaslaghyartha i.e. Pratiyamanartha which has been determined as the sould of poetry. cf. *Ata Eva Artha Ityekatayopakramya Sahrdayaslaghya Iti Visesanadvara Hetum Abhidhayapoddharadrsa Tasya Dvau Bhedavamsavityuktam Na Tu Dvavapyatmanau Kavayasyeti*[49] and *Sa Eka Evartho Dvisak-hataya Vivekibhirvibhagabuddhya Vibhajyate.*[50] The lines of the Aloka clearly go to prove that Tasya relates to the Sahrdayaslaghy-artha which has been recognised as the soul of poetry. If Prati-yamanartha were intended in the first half of the Karika, the Vibha-gakarana would not be justified. Hence the only way to get out of the difficulty is to regard Sahrdayaslaghyartha as referring to the meaning in general pertaining to Kavya. The adjective Sahr-dayaslaghya probably calculated to mark off the Kavyagatartha from Vedasastrapuranadigatartha. Locanakara appears to have confused that Dhvani alluded to in the expressions Kavyasyatma in the first Karika and the Artha which has been put down as the Kavyatma in the Karika under discussion. The former, i.e. Kavy-asyatma in *Kavyasyatma Dhvaniriti* etc. gives us the Dhvanivadin's conception of the soul of poetry while the latter, i.e. Kavyatma in *Yo Rthah Sahrdayaslaghyah Kavyatmeti Vyavasthitah* that of the earlier rhetoricians who have failed to mention or recognise the principle of Dhvani. There is no need of construing first half of the Karika as establishing Kavyatmatva for Pratiyamanartha

49. Locana
50. Locana

since the existence of Pratiyamanartha itself has not been proved. What Dhvanikara actually does is to expound at first the two-fold nature of sense in poetry and then point out that it is only the Pratiyamana division that forms the soul of poetry. cf. *Kavyasyatma Sa Evarthah.*[51] It may be observed that Sahrdayaslaghyatva of the Artha is not distinguishing characteristic of Pratiyamana only for words and senses containing figures of speech and poetic merits are also capable of producing delight in the minds of men of taste. Dhvanikara never wants us to believe that there is no Sahrdayaslaghyatva for Vacyartha. Although both the Vacya and the Pratiyamana can be Sahrdayaslaghya, he would consider the Pratiyamanartha only as the soul of poetry since there is a superior charm associated with it by reason of the suggestiveness characterising it.

*Lalitocitasannivesacarunah.* Kavya is Lalitocitasannivesacaru. The adjective Lalita and Ucita given to Sannivesa denote the Alankarayuktatva and Gunayuktatva of Sabdartharacana which bring about loveliness to poetry. Alankaras and Gunas are of course the factors recognised by earlier rhetoricians as producing Carutva to poetry. cf. *Sabdarthasariram Tavat Kavyam. Tatra Ca Sabdagatascarutvahetavo ʃnuprasadayah Prasiddha Eva. Arthagatascopamadayah. Varnasamghatanadharmasca Ye Madhuryadayastepi Pratiyante.*[52]

The interpretation of Locanakara that Lalita refers to Gunalankaranugraha and Ucita to Rasavisayaucitya does not seem to fit in with the context is so far as the word Kavya both in the Karika and the Vrtti would appear on close scrutiny to refer to poetry as conceived by the predecessors of Dhvanikara. Hence Lalitocitasannivesacaru will have to be explained in such a way as to bring out the nature of poetry as indicated in the definitions already set forth. As no reference to Vyangya is found in the definitions given by earlier rhetoricians, there is no justification in saying as Locanakara has done *Ucitasabdena Rasavisayam Aucityam Bhavatiti-Darsayan Rasadhvanerjivitatvam Sucayati.*[53]

51. Dhvanyaloka, I Udyota, V. Karika
52. Dhvanyaloka, I Udyota, the Vrtti under the first Karika
53. Locana

*Sarirasyevatma Sararupataya Sthitah.* Of the two constituents of poetry, viz. Sabda and Artha, Artha stands as the principal factor, for it is to convey meanings that words are employed. The relation between the word and the sense is that of the body and the soul. The quality common to Artha in poetry and Atman in Sarira is Sararupataya Sthitatvam, i.e. the quality of abiding as the leading principle. Of Sabda and Artha, Atmatva attributed to Artha by ancient rhetoricians will thus be seen to be based upon its comparative importance.

*Tatra.* Of the two divisions of the sense, viz. Vacya and Pratiyamana.

*Prasiddhah.* Widely known because of its non-obscurity, The Vacya is universally popular like Vanitavadana, Udyana, Indudaya, etc.

Note that it was the celebriety of Vacyartha that made it easy for earlier rhetoricians to expound it in manifold ways.

*Prakarairupamadibhih.* By distinctions of Arthalankaras like Upama, etc.

*Kavyalaksmavidhayibhih.* The reference is to the Alankara school of rhetoricians like Bhamaha and Udbhata.

*Pratiyamanam ........... Lavanyamivanganasu.* This Karika draws attention to the difference of Pratiyamanartha from Vacyartha with the help of an apt illustration. The Anyatva of the Pratiyamanartha is adduced through a process of inference. The essential factors for an Anumana, viz. Paksha, Sadhya, Hetu and Udaharana have all been given. The Paksa is the suggested sense met with in the words of great poets, the Sadhya is its difference from the expressed sense, the Hetu is its gleaning forth as distinct from the well-known constituents and the Udaharana is Lavanya (grace) observable in charming women.

The existence of Pratiyamanartha needs no establishment since men of taste could, of course, perceive it in the words of great poets like Grace in beautiful women. Just as Lavanya is met with only in excelling women, so also Pratiyamanartha presents itself only in the words of poets endowed with real poetic merit. The

Pratiyamanartha is the only factor bringing about excellence to words and in this respect, it is analogous to Lavanya,[54] by which certain women are highly praised above others. The reality of such a factor in poetry can never be gainsaid. What is required here is not so much bringing in evidences for its existence as establishing its distinctness from Vacyartha. It has to be understood that like Lavanya which stands apart from the well-known or embellished parts of the body in women, the Pratiyamanartha in poetry forms a reality altogether different from the commonly known constituents in the form of Sabda and Artha beautified by Alankaras and Gunas.

*Yattat.* May be construed as a group of pronouns forming a single whole to mean 'that which is referred to'. A better interpretation perhaps is to take Yat as being used in the sense of Yasmaddhetoh and Tad as referring to Pratiyamanam Vastu. Yattatprasiddhavayavatiriktam then mean by which reason it (Pratiyamanam Vastu) gleans forth as distinct from the Prasiddhavayavas.

Locanakara in taking Yattat as a Sarvanamasamudaya observes that it is indicative of the unparalleled excellence and mixed up character of Vacya and Pratiyamana on the one hand and Avayavas and Lavanya on the other. cf. *Yattaditi Sarvanamasamudayascamatkarasarataprakatikaranartham Avyapadesyatvam Anyonyasamvalanakrtam Cavyatirekabhramam Drstantadarstanti kayordarsayati.*[55]

It may, however, be remarked that the point which is attempted to be brought out is only the difference of Pratiyamanartha from Vacyartha and as the Anirvacaniyatva of Pratiyamanartha is not primarily connected with the context, it is more fitting that Yattad is construed as a mere connective or as a Hetuvakyaghataka in the manner indicated above.

Didhitikara is seen to take Yad and Tad as different pronouns, their connection and antecedents being explained as *Yat Trisakham*

54. See the definition of Lavanya given by Singubhatta.
55. Locana.

*Pratiyamanam Vastu Vibhati, Tadanyadevasti, Na Tu Sabdarthadirupam Vidyata Ityarthah.*[56]

This besides involving Anvayaklesa, also goes against the text of Aloka wherein Yad and Tad are grouped together as in the Karika. According to Locanakara the total sense of the Karika may be put thus: "There exists in poetry a sense Pratiyamana which is distinct from Vacyartha and forms the most important principle. The existence of Pratiyamanartha is borne out by the fact that it shines forth. cf. *Punahsabdo Vacyadvisesavyotakah. Tadvyatiriktam Sarabhutam Cetyarthah ......... Yadevamvidhamasti Tadbhati. Na Hyatyantasato Bhanamupapannam. Rajatadyapi Natyantamasadbhati. Anena Sattvaprayuktam Tavadbhanamiti Bhasanat Sattvamavagamyate. Tena Yadbhati Tadasti Tathetyuktam Bhavati,*[57] Thus Hetuhetumadbhava is supposed by Locanakara to be subsisting between Bhasana and Sattva. The affirmative and negative arguments proving the Astitva of Pratiyamana are "*Yad Bhati Tad Asti*" and "*Yad Nasti Tad Na Bhati.*"

Against Locanakara's interpretation, it may be said that there is no necessity of establishing the existence of Pratiyamana since Pratiyamanartha is Sahrdayahrdayavedya nor is the importance of Pratiyamana over Vacya intended to be conveyed, for the topic under discussion is the setting forth of two distinct divisions to the Sahrdayaslaghyartha and nothing more. This will be evident from the text of the Aloka "*Sarvesu Ca Tesu Prakaresu Tasya Vacyadanyatvam*"[58] where Anyatva obviously means difference.'

Sahrdayahrdayasuprasiddham occurring after Yattat in the Vrtti is indicative of the Siddhatva of the Paksa i.e., Pratiyamanartha. Hence there cannot be attributed the defect called Asrayasiddhi to the Hetu as in *Gaganaravindam Surabhi Aravindatva Sarojaravindatvat.* When Pratiyamanartha is thus accomplished through its Sahrdayahrdayasuprasiddhatva attempts to establish its Asttiva based on arguments like "*Yad Bhati Tadasti*" and "*Yad Nasti Tad Na Bhati*" set forth by Locanakara and others are of no avail.

56. Didhiti.
57. Locana
58. Locana

The words Alankrtebhyah and Pratitebhyah are both to be understood as the meanings of Prasiddhebhyah and as such their Gunalankarayuktatva as well as Praspastatva are intended. The connective Va shows that Prasiddhebhyah can be interpreted in the two ways fitting with the context as indicated above.

*Prthannirvarnyamanam*, has to be understood as Prthak Nirvarnyamanam Sat and would mean when separately viewed with a scrutinising eye!

*Kimapyanyadeva Sahrdayalocanamrtam Tattvantaram*. Locanakara considers Kimapi etc. as an elucidation of Yattad (in the Karika) which latter is construed by him as a Sarvanamasamudaya denoting the inexplicability of the Drstanta and the Darstantika. cf. *Etacca Kimapityadina Vyacaste*.[59] Yattad has already been shown to be a mere connective. It appears that Kimapi is employed only to define the nature of Anyatva referred to and this is corroborated by Sahrdayalocanamrtam Tatvantaram which follows as an amplification of the idea intended to be conveyed by Kimapyanyadeva. Sahrdayalocanamrtam and Tattvantaram have to be understood as the meanings of Kimapi and Anyat respectively.

*Tadvadeva So Rthah*. Lavanya which acts like ambrosia to the eyes of men of taste stands altogether different from the bodily constituent. So indeed is the Pratiyamanartha.

The Vrtti beginning with Sa Hyarthah shows how the sense which is argued to be different from Vacyartha is presented and what exact nature it assumes.

*Vacyasamarthyaksiptam*, is to be connected not only with Vastumatram but with Alankarah and Rasadayah also. When read along with Alankarah and Rasadayah, the necessary alteration in gender and number has to be made as *Vacyasamarthyaksiptah Alankarah* and *Vacyasamarthyaksiptah Rasadayah*. While Vacya arises through Sabdasamarthya or the force of the word, Pratiyamana arises through Vacyasamarthya or the force of the expressed sense. Of the three kinds of Pratiyamanarthas in the forms of Vastu, Alankara and Rasa, the first two are Laukika in as much as Vastu

59. Locana

and Alankara are familiar to us as occurring in an expressed manner as well. On the other hand the third variety Rasa manifests itself only as suggested and as such is Kavyavyavaharagocara. cf. *Tatra Pratiyamanasya Tavaddvau Bhedau - Laukikah Kavyavyavaharago-carsceti.*[60]

*Vastumatram.* Since the word Vastu may be employed to denote any sense in general including Alankara and Rasa. The suffix Matrac is used to restrict it in the sense of a matter other than Alankara or Rasa.

*Alankarah.* The name Alankaradhvani for Alankaras of a suggested nature is justified by Brahmanasramananyaya. Although the Alankaras when suggested do not deserve the name Alankara by reason of their not going to embellish anything, they are termed Alankaradhvanih on account of their embellishing nature when in an expressed state.

*Rasadayah.* By the word Adi are to be understood Bhava, Rasabhasa, Bhavabhasa, Bhavasanti, Bhavodaya, Bhavasandhi and Bhavasabalata.

*Sarvesu Ca Tesu Prakaresu.* In all the varieties and the sub varieties.

*Tasya.* Of the Pratiyamanartha.

The fact that Pratiyamana of all the three kinds is altogether different from the expressed sense is established next in the Vrtti beginning with *Tathahyadyastavat Prabhedah* and running up to *Trtiyopi Prabhedo Vacyad Bhinna Eveti Sthitam.*

*Adyastavat Prabhedah.* Pratiyamana of the type of Vastu.

*Duram Vibhedavan.* The remoteness (Duratva) of the difference is made clear by the examples which follow. It is illustrated best in cases where Vacya has the form of impulsion while Vyangya is of a prohibitory character and vice versa. It goes without saying that impulsion and prohibition are remotely different from one another.

60. Locana.

*Bhrama ............ Drptasimhena.* The verse forms the words of a woman who was to meet by appointment her paramour in a bower on the shore of the river Goda to a pious person who proceeds to the same spot for the purpose of gathering flowers. She says that he can move along his path fearlessly since the dog which used to alarm him on the way has been slain. Here the Vacyartha is Bhramanavidhi or direction to move forward freely. The sense suggested is Bhramananisedha or prohibition of his moving along which is thrown out by the mention of the existence of the lion, in the bower towards which he wends his way. Svabhaya which stood in the way of his forward motion has been removed, now that the dog has met his death at the hands of the lion. Hence the Vacyartha here is obviously Bhramanavidhi in the form of Bhramananisedhabhava. On the strength of the circumstances of the speaker, the expressions *Godanadikacchakunjavasina Drptasimhena Maritah* would, on further cogitation suggest to the mind of a Sahrdaya that her words have a prohibitory significance. The fact that the lion is haughty and that he is bold enough to make his depredatory visits to the villages is calculated to suggest that a person who betakes himself unarmed to the place which in his (lion's) usual habitation, will meet with diresome consequences. The speaker believes that the hearer who is pious by disposition and destitute of the devices to protect himself would, on an understanding of the implications of her words, never dare to proceed. Since the words of the woman have thus the effect of a Nisedha in making him turn back, the sense suggested will be found to be of a contrary nature to the sense expressed.

It cannot be said that both the senses are simultaneously denoted by Abhidha for the reason that they are of a mutually antagonistic nature, the one being Bhavarupa and the other Abhavarupa. Nor can it be contended that one arises after the other through the working of Abhidha for, Abhidha becomes exhausted after conveying one sense is incapable of presenting the other, cf. *Visesyam Nabhidha Gacchet Ksinasaktirvisesane*[61] according to which Nyaya Abhidha is incapable of reaching as far as Vyakti on account of its power of expression getting exhausted in conveying the Jati.

61. Locana

Likewise Abhidha which operates in the presentation of the Vidhirupartha desists to work with regard to the Nisedharupartha.

A Purvapaksa can be raised from the Abhihitanvayavadin's standpoint that the Tatparyartha or the particular sense intended to be conveyed being Nisedha should be considered as the Vakyartha and that this should be supposed as being brought into manifestation by the working of Laksana. The Vacyartha obviously being Bhramanavidhi, the Tatparyartha has to be understood as arising through the operation of another Vyapara which, in this particular instance, is Laksana. The requisites for Laksana, viz. Mukhyarthabadha and Nimitta will be found to be present in the inapplicability of the expressions like Drpta, Dharmika, etc. and Virodha or contrarity between the two senses respectively.

Against this view, it may be said that there is no incompatibility of the Mukhyartha of the verse for the want of the circumstance (Svabhaya) in favour of Bhramananisedha. It is only after Vacyarthabodha that the futility of the expressions Drpta, Dharmika etc., strikes us. On the other hand in places where Laksana has to be necessarily resorted to as in *Gangayam Ghosah* the Anvaya itself is impossible of being conceived in as much as Gangapravaha does not deserve to be the Adhikarana of the Ghosa. Thus it is clear that Laksana is to be resorted to only when there arises incompatibility of the Mukhyartha immediately after Padarthopasthiti or the comprehension of the meanings of individual words. In the instance cited, the incompatibility strikes us only after Vacyarthabodha or knowledge of the expressed sense and on a consideration of the particularities of the speaker etc. Hence there is no scope for Laksana in this connection and the Bhramananisedha is undoubtedly suggested. cf. *Utpannepi Vakyarthabodhe Bhavannapi Badho Kincitkara Eva.*[62]

Mahimabhatta who has tried to establish that what Dhvanikara contends to be Vyangyavyanjakabhava is nothing but Anumeyanumapakabhava holds the view that in instances of the kind quoted the sense said to be Vyangya like Bhramananisedha etc., is got through Anumana. The removal of the cause of fear i.e. Svamarana mentioned as being favourable to Bhramana of the Dharmika

62. Kavyapradipa.

has been effected by the lion who has his abode in the bower on the shores of Goda. From this can be understood the existence of the lion in the Godanadikacchanikunja and the fact that there is Bhayakarana preventing him from proceeding to the place. In this connection Mahimabhatta observes that the Bhramana of a Bhiru takes place only after his ascertainment of Bhayakarananivrtti. A knowledge of the existence of the lion (Simhopalabdhi) in the Nikunja goes to show that the place is to be avoided by one who fears even a dog. In the light of these arguments Mahimabhatta arrives at the following Anumana:– *Idam Godavarinikunjam Svabhirubhramanayogyam Simhavattvat.* Herein we find that the Vacyartha in the form of Nikunjavasikrtaya Svanivrttya Grhe Bhramanavidhih is capable of leading us to the inference of Nikunjaabhramanayogyata on the part of the Svabhiru. The view of Mahimabhatta is refuted by Pradipakara[63] who makes it clear that the invariable concomitant necessary for an Anumana fails in the instance quoted. A person fearing a dog even if he be of a cowardly disposition, may, at the instance of his preceptor or actuated by feelings of love or if he knows that a treasure awaits him at the spot, proceed to a place inhabited by a lion. The same may happen also with regard to one who is naturally brave but fears that he may be polluted by the touch of the dog or wants to avoid the slaying of an insignificant creature. Further the inference is faulty because of the lack of *Pramanantara* for the ascertainment of the Hetu (Simhasadbhava) in the Paksa (Godavarinikunja). Thus in the absence of invariable concomitance of the Hetu and the Sadhya and for the non-ascertainment of the residence of Hetu on Paksa (Paksadharmata) Anumana itself fails to be conceived.

*Bhrama.* Here the imperative (Lot) is used in the sense of Atisarga (assent) and Praptakala (due time). cf. *Traisatisargapraptakalesu Krtyasca.*[64] Bhrama, therefore, means 'you are allowed to proceed along and the time for your Bhramana has arrived. The allowance (Kamacaranujna) consists in the speaker's acquainting the Dharmika with the non-existence of Bhramananisedhakarana. The Praptakalatva rests with the propriety and desirability of proceeding along at that time. The speaker's direction is

63. Pradipa
64. Panini

calculated to draw the Dharmika's attention to the fact that he should not show any delay in discharging his duties.

*Dharmika.* The person addressed being one following righteous path, must needs proceed to the place where he could gather flowers etc., for his worship. It will only be proper that he continues to move instead of stopping short in the middle of his way.

*Visrabdhah.* Being confident because of the non-existence of the cause of his fear.

*Sa Sunakah.* That dog which used to alarm you in the way formerly.

*Adya.* Implies that a lucky day has come for the Dharmika. Cf. *Purvam Vidhih Pratikulo Bhut, Idanim Tu Bhavadbhagyamahimna Nukulo Jata Ityartham Dyotayati.*[65]

*Maritah.* Shows that the dog will no more give trouble to the Dharmika.

*Tena.* This word qualifying Drptasimhena denotes that the Dharmika himself may have previously heard of the existence of the lion from the talk of the people of the locality.

*Drptasimhena.* The Drptatva attributed to the lion brings out that the range of his rovings has enlarged and the fierceness of his depredations have exceeded all previous bounds. It may be noted that the Drptatvarupavisesana of the lion is helpful when construing the Vacyartha in accounting for the slaying of the dog in the village. When the Vyangyartha is considered, the Drptatva qualifying the lion tends to suggest that even Gramabhramana is Bhayahetuka which latter in its turn goes to indicate that Tirabhramana is still more Bhayahetuka not to speak of the extreme apprehension of danger one betaking himself to the Nikunja would be subject to.

*Svasruratra ........... Manksih.* The verse forms the words of a woman whose husband is abroad to a wayfarer who was permitted to stay in her house.

65. Balapriya.

The expressed sense is Nisedharupa, viz., Majjananisedha, The Nisedha as embodied in Ma Manksih will be seen to be intended to ward off the contingency of the traveller's stepping in upon the beds. The Nisedha be put in other words is Sambhavyamanamajjanarupapravrttinivartanarupa. The suggested sense contained is Vidhirupa, viz. Majjanavidhi. It may be observed that the Majjanavidhi suggested is Majjananisedhabhavarupa, ie., of the form of a negation of prohibition from falling. The word Mahana occurring in the Prakrt verse quoted in illustration is interpreted in the sense of Avayoh. Since there is equal possibility of the traveller's falling accidentally on the beds of the woman as well as her mother-in-law during night, the Vacyartha in the form of Majjananisedha (prohibition of falling) has to be understood as referring to both their beds as Adhara. The Vyangyartha in the form of Majjananisedhabhava refers to the bed of the woman and not to that of her mother-in-law. Hence Avayoh should be understood as used in the sense of Nama. Although the woman had only her own bed in her mind she used the dual form Avayoh in order to conceal the invitation that she was extending to the new comer from others. The suggested sense is not a Vidhi of Apravrttapravartanarupa but Pravartananisedhabhavarupa. If it is a direction or a request to the effect that the new comer should spend the night with the woman it will be quite unbecoming of her self respect. For a woman who is conscious of her charms will never thrust her affections on a man. On the other hand we know by reading in between the lines that the woman had already understood his fascination for her with the help of her scrutinising eye. Her words then are intended to instil courage and confidence into him under the circumstances and to advise him that he has to be careful in not stepping upon her mother-in-law's bed by mistake. Hence the Vidhi suggested by Nisedha is rightly interpreted to be of Nisedhabhavarupa.

*Pathika*: This vocative justifies the woman's getting into voluntary conversation with a stranger. He, being a traveller, who has betaken himself to her house seeking quarters for rest, it is only in the fitness of things that the woman of the house extends to him her hospitality. When construing the Vyangyartha, the same word Pathika! must be taken to denote the fact that the stranger is one who has been subject to the pangs of separation from his

wife for a long time and that he would be on that score desirous of associating himself with a woman.

*Ratryndhaka* : The stranger is addressed thus, the quality of Ratryandhakatva (partial blindness during night) being superimposed on him in order that the warning given to him may be justified. In the Vyangyarthadasa, the word Ratryandhaka! should be explained as indicating the excessive passion by which the stranger would be taken during night which time usually inflames the minds of young people like him. The propriety of her invitation will be made clear from the helpless condition of excitement she conceives that the stranger would be put to during night.

*Svasruratra Nimajjati.* The place where the mother-in-law lies is pointed out to the stranger so that he may not cause any disturbance to her sleep. What is suggested here is that the old woman who is seen in the house with her will not like the speaker's union with him, she being her husband's mother and that therefore the union he is longing for should be effected unnoticed by her.

*Atraham.* It is clear that the Vacyartha is nothing but her acquainting the stranger with her sleeping place so that he may avoid walking that way lest he should stumble on her. The suggested sense is that she is the only person sleeping in the particular place pointed out by her and that the Vidhi in the form of Majjananisedhabhava is with reference to her bed as Adhara.

*Divasakam Pralokaya.* The suffix Ka in the word Divasakam is Alparthaka and the accusative is used in the sense of Atyantasamyoga. cf. *Kaladhvanoratyantasamyoge.*[66] What the woman wants to convey is that there is only very little of the day time left and that the stranger has therefore to ascertain himself the places where the beds are laid by looking throughout the time his vision lasts since he would be unable to see properly during night. The same sentence 'Divasakam Pralokaya' helps the suggested sense by being explained as 'Look forward till this wretched daytime which is quite unfavourable to our secret dealings passes away'. It may be noted in the latter case the suffix Ka has Kutsitarthatva.

66. Panini.

*Anubhayarupah.* Vyangyartha which is neither in the form of a Vidhi or a Pratisedha.

*Vraja ............ Janisata.* The speaker is a woman who is cross with her lover at his being enamoured of another woman.

The expressed sense is an impulsion and this is Vrajananisedhabhavarupa for the hero in spite of his eagerness to betake himself to his new lady-love stays with his concubine in consideration of his former affections and because he did not want to incur her displeasure. What is suggested is the woman's indignation towards her lover who has been guilty of infidelity. Since she was able to know his inward affection for another woman from the colour of his face and his calling her unawares by the name of the lady of his heart etc. she had no difficulty in perceiving his reverential deportment had no sincerity behind it. She therefore, displays her wrath knowing as she does that he only pretends affection for her while his heart is fixed on another woman. As has been said the Vacyartha here in the form of a Vidhi does not yield a suggested sense in the form of a Nisedha nor does the Vacyartha suggest a Vidhi of a Nisedhabhava form other than that of Vrajana. Hence the Vyangyartha in the verse is obviously Anubhayarupa or indifferent. It is to be understood that the Manyu suggested assumes the form of a Vastu or a fact. cf. *Kevalam Purvakrtanupalanatmana Daksinyenaikarupatadhimanenaiva Tvam Atra Sthitah, Tat Sarvatha Satho Siti Gadhamanyurupo Yam Khanditanayikabhiprayo Tra Pratiyate.*[67]

*Prarthaye ......... Hatase!* The verse forms the words of a youth to a woman who goes out her own accord to meet a person on whom she had fixed her affections.

The Vacyartha is Pratisedharupa in as much as the youth requests her to go back which is as good as prohibiting her forward motion. The very word Nivartasva shows that the Nisedha here consists in forbidding an action which is already commenced. The vocative *Mukhasasijyotsnaviluptatamonivahe!* is explanatory of how the causes hindrance to the free motion of other Abhisarikas who are naturally afraid of moonlight. Since there is every possibility of

67. Locana.

the veil of darkness being removed by the radiance emanating from the moon in the form of her face she stands a chance of being detected by others in the way. The fact that she is thus frustrated in her hopes is made clear by the youth's addressing her as Hatase! What the youth suggests is the desirability of a woman of her excessive charms to cherish love for one who is incapable of understanding her extra ordinary beauty and does not betake himself to her of his own accord to win her affection. cf. *Na Ratnamanvisyati Mrgyate Hi Tat.*[68] In addition to this he also conveys in a suggested manner the fact that she should extend her love to him who fully appreciates her loveliness and that she is sure to be happy by the attainment of her object should she accept him. In construing the Vyangyartha her standing in the way of other Abhisarikas must be explained as due to the indiscriminate taste of the person to meet whom she is going, who is devoted to many women of inferior beauty and accomplishments. Thus the suggested sense has neither the form of a Pratisedha in the form of Purogamanapravrttinivarana or of a Vidhi to the effect of Pratigamana.

It may be noted that there is difference of opinion with regard to the context of this verse and the suggested sense contained therein. Locanakara considers the verse to be those of a Nayaka who meets a woman who proceeds to his house at the appointed time and explains the Vyangyartha as *Madiyam Va Grhamagaccha Tvadiyam Va Gacchava Ityubhayatrapi Atatparyadanuhhayarupo Vallabhabhiprayascatvatma Vyangya Ityevavatisthate.*[69] According to Locanakara, Anubhayarupatva will have to be construed as Vidhinisedhobhayatmakatva i.e., both Gamanavidhi and Nivartana consist in the implication of Nivartasva in both Purogamananisedha and Purogamananisedhabhavarupavidhi. The dual character of the Vyangya yielding from the Pratisedha which is vacya will be made clear by amplifying Locanakara's words beginning with *Madiyam Va Grham* as Madiyam Grham Praptum tvam cara and Prepsitasya Mama Praptya Itahparam Ma Carih. It will be seen that this conception of Anubhayarupatva of Vidhi and Pratisedha is of quite a different nature as conceived in the previous verse *Vraja Mamaivaikasya* etc, where the Vyangyartha is a Vastu which has

68. Kumarasambhava.
69. Locana.

nothing to do with a Vidhi or a Pratisedha. Hence in order that the Anubhayarupatva may agree with the one pointed out in the previous verse, the context and the Vyangyartha have been explained in a different way.

In the four examples cited above, the remoteness of Vyangyartha from Vacyartha has been made clear. It goes without saying that Vidhi and Pratisedha are of totally different characters. In the same way, Vidhi or Pratisedha will also be seen to be far from identical with a fact suggested which is neither standing in the form of Pratisedha nor Vidhi.

*Vibhinnavisayatvena.* Visaya here must be understood as meaning the person who is to be intended to be informed and the subject concerned. If in Vyangyartha the person and the subject matter differ from those of the Vacyartha, there arises Vibhinnavisayatva.

*Kasya Va ............ Sahasvedanim.* The verse forms the words of a woman's confidence to her mistress at the unexpected appearance of the husband on the shores of a lotus pond where she (mistress) had secret dealings with her paramour a few moments previously. The expressed sense in the form of a rebuke to her mistress calling attention to her indiscrete behaviour in having smelt the lotus in spite of repeated warnings is intended for the husband who can naturally be expected to be inquisitive as to know the causes of the wounds on her lower lip. The Vacyartha, no doubt, helps towards the non-entertainment of any suspicion on the part of the husband. The Sabhramarapadmaghranavrttanta which is mentioned as responsible for the contusion of the mistress's lower lip has the husband in view as the comprehender.

The Vyangyartha is a reproach to the woman for her having heedlessly enjoyed the company of her paramour against the advice of her female companion. The Vrttanta presented in the Vyangyartha is her amorous sports with her paramour in such a way as to cause suspicious marks on her body and the person concerned is the woman put in an awkward predicament at the sudden appearance of her lord. Thus the Vibhinnavisayatva could be established for the expressed and the suggested senses accruing in the verse. It is worthy of note in this connection that Locanakara

explained the Vibhinnavisayatva in a number of ways. The sense in the form of Sabhramarapadmaghrana which is presented by Abhidhavyapara is construed by Locanakara as the Vyangyartha while Jarasangama which is got through Vyanjanavyapura is taken by him as the Vacyartha. How Locanakara's view could be justified is a matter for consideration.

*Anye caivamvidhah ......... sambhavanti.* What has been said above is illustrative of Vastuvyangya, the remoteness of which from the expressed sense is distinctly palpable. In addition to the types of Vastuvyangya described, other varieties also could be met with. For the factors that go to suggest a sense other than the expressed one, see Sahityadarpana :

> *Boddhrsvarupasamkhyanimittakaryapratitikalanam*
> *asrayavisayadinam Bhedadbhinno bhidheyato vyangyah*[70]

and Kavyanusasana: *Vaktrpratipadyakakuvakyavacyanyasattiparstavadesakalacestadivisesavasadarthasyapi mukhyamukhyavyangyatmano vyanjakatvam*[71]

*Vibhedinah.* That are distinctly different.

*Pratiyamanabhedah.* Different kinds of suggested sense.

*Dvitiyopi Prabhedah.* The second type of Dhvani i.e. Alankaradhvani is one in which the suggested sense takes the form of an Alankara. The difference between the Vyangyartha and the Vacyartha is obvious in instances of Alankaradhvani where the expressed sense happens to be a Vastu. For example in *Atrantare ............Mahakalah*[72] the Prakaranikartha got through Abhidha is concerned with the Grismakalasamujjrmbhana while the suggested sense is a figure of speech in the form of simile drawing attention to the Upamanopameyabhava between the Aprakaranikartha and the Prakaranikartha relating to Siva and Grismakala respectively. Also when both the expressed and the suggested senses form figures of speech as in *Sa Vaktumakhilam ........ Mahodadheh,*[73] there is difference between the Vacyalankara and the

70. Sahityadarpana
71. Kavyanusasana
72. Locana
73. Locaan

Vyangyalankara in so far as the former has Sabda and the latter has Artha as their Bodhakas. It may be noted that Vivaksitanyaparavacyadhvani under which Alankaradhvani takes its rank has in all cases the expressed sense as the Vyanjaka, Sabda being only Sahakarin or a dependent co-operator. Thus the Vyangyalankara which is aroused by the Vacyartha through the help of a power other than Abhidha or Laksana will be seen to be considerably different from the Vacyalankara which is aroused by the Sabda through the help of the primary power of words. The difference will be clear when we know that one (Vacyalankara) is suggestive and the other (Vyangyalankara) suggested.

*Saprapancam Agre Darsayisyate.* Since Alankaras assume numerous shapes, Alankaradhvani deserves to be treated in detail separately and this is done in the second Udyota under Samlaksyakramavyangya, the second division of Vivaksitanyaparavacyadhvani. cf. *Yatha Hi Vidhinisedhatadanubhayatmana Rupena Sankalayya Vastudhvanih Samksepena Suvacah Tatha Nalankaradhvanih, Alankaranam Bhuyastvat.*[74]

*Rasadilaksanah.* By the word Adi are to be understood Bhava, Rasabhasa, Bhavabhasa, etc.

*Vacyasamarthyaksiptah...... Vyaparavisayah.* Rasa, Bhava etc. are never got through Saksacchabdavyapara i.e Abhidhavyapara. Nevertheless they shine forth in poetry to the greatest relish of men of taste. The very life breath of Rasa, etc. is their relishability. See the derivation Rasyate Asvadyate Iti Rasah. The apprehension of Rasadi can be explained as arising only through the force of Vacyartha in the form of Vibhavadipratipadana. The words which convey Vibhavadis are accessories in the matter of presenting Rasa, etc., the main Vyanjaka being Vibhavadis themselves. The presentation of Rasadis cannot be said to be effected by Laksana since the requisites for Laksana as Mukhyarthabadha, etc. are absent. The apprehension of Rasadis, therefore arises through a power quite different from Abhidha and Laksana. This Vyapara is none other than Dhvanana. It cannot be contended that there is Janyajanakabhava or Anumapyanumapakabhava between Rasa and the Vacyartha (Vibhavadis). In

74. Locana

expressions like *Putraste Jatah,* the Janyajanakabhava between the delight one experiences on hearing the words the Putrajananarupartha is obvious. Rasapratiti does not stand on a par with this for even in the absence of Vibhavadis there is the realisation of Rasa. Anumapyanumapakabhava as in *Pino Devadatto Diva Na Bhunkte* also is impossible to be argued as existing between Rasadis and Vibhavadis in as much as there is no Vyapti in the form of Avinabhava between them. cf. *Vibhavadyabhavepi Rasadipratitiprasakter na Janyajanakabhavah; Avinabhavarupavyaptyabhavacca Na Lingalingibhavah Ityubhayavailksanyasiddhih.*[75]

The difference between Rasa and Bhava consists in the former being the enjoyment in the state of feeling relished by men of taste being permanent in the former and transitory in the latter. Abhasatva or semblance of Rasa or Bhava arises when there is strangeness or impropriety is observable with regard to the state of feeling. The nature of Bhavasanti, etc. which also range themselves under the third division will be made clear later.

In the portion of Aloka beginning with *Tatha Hi Vacyatvam* running up to *Nabhidheyatvam Kathancit,* the contention of the Purvapaksin that Rasa etc. are Vacya is refuted.

The Siddhantin who holds the view that the Rasadilaksana variety is only thrown out by the force of Vacyartha and never presented through the primary power of words raises here two points for consideration. There is no difference of opinion as in the cognisance of Rasa. The question is whether it could ever be presented in an expressed manner. The Purvapaksin who tries to establish the Vacyatva of Rasadis will have to say that the Vacyatva is accomplished either through Svasabdaniveditatva or through Vibhavadipratipadana. In the former case there should be employment of words like Rasa, Bhava, etc. in general or Srngara, Lajja, etc. in particular. For a thing to be known through Abhidhavyapara, the employment of the conventional word denoting it is necessary. In the latter case he will have to argue the Vacyatva of Rasadis by Vibhavadipratipadana through Janyajanakabhava as in *Putraste Jatah* or through Anumapyanumapakabhava as in *Pino Devadatto Diva Na Bhunkte.*

75. Kaumudi.

*Purvasmin ............ Prasangah.* There should result the non-apprehension of Rasa etc. where there is no Svasabdaniveditatva if we accept the first view i.e Rasa, Bhava, etc. are cognised through Svasabdaniveditatva for where there is no Karana, the Karya should not exist. But Rasadis are cognised even in the absence of Svasabdaniveditatva. Thus no Vyatirekavyapti could be argued to exist between Svasabdaniveditatva and Rasapratiti. For example in–

*Sayita Savidhe Pyanisvara*
*Saphalikartumaho Manorathan*
*Dayita Dayitananambujam*
*Daramilannayana Niriksate*

there is the durable state of feeling Rati suggested through the representation of Vibhavadis although there are no Sabdas like Rasa, Srngara, Rati, etc.

*Sarvatra.* In all instances of Kavyas where Rasa, Bhava etc. are found.

*Tesam.* For Rasa etc.

*Yatrapi.* Even in instances of Kavyas where Rasadis are cognised.

*Tat.* Svasabdaniveditatvam

*Visista ............Mukhena.* By depicting particular Vibhava, etc. suited to the sentiment concerned.

*Esam.* Of Rasa etc.

The absence of Anvayavyapti between Svasabdaniveditatva and Rasadipratiti is pointed out herein. In instances of Kavyas where Rasadipratiti occurs along with the appearance of words like Srngara, Rati, etc. it is only due to Visistavibhavadipratipadana that the Rasa etc. are presented. As an example can be cited the verse *Grivabhangabhiramam* etc. of Sakuntala in which Bhayanakarasa is found. It is not the word Bhaya in *Sarapatanabhayad* that makes the Rasa known. The cognisance of Rasa is due to a proper description of Vibhava etc. Moreover where Svasabdas

alone are found without Vibhavadis, the apprehension of Rasa etc. is absent. Thus Anvayavyabhicara in the form of Svasabdasattvepi Rasadipratityabhavah stands in the way of the acceptance of the first view c.f. *Eko Rasah Karuna Eva* etc. in Uttararamacarita in which there is no Karunarasa although the words Rasa and Karuna are found.

*Svasabdena ..................Anudyate.* In instances like *Grivabhangabhiramam* the words Bhaya etc. are only Anuvadakas of the sentiments thrown out by Vibhavadipratipadana.

*Visayantare.* In places where words denoting Vibhava etc. are absent and at the same time contain expressions like Rati, Karuna Bhaya, etc.

*Tatha.* As is found in places where there is the express mention of Vibhavadis.

*Tasyah.* Of the apprehension of Rasa etc.

*Na Hi Kevala ........... Pratitirasti.* This forms almost an explanation of the Vakya *Visayantare Tatha Tasya Adarsanat.*

*Yatasca Svabhidhanamantarena ...... Kathancit.* This portion of the Aloka summarises the points advanced in refutation of the Vacyatva of Rasadis and sets forth the contention that they are only thrown out by the Vacyasamarthya. The Vyaptis in one case put together with the Vyabhicaras in the other pointed out in the text take the following forms:– *Yatra Yatra Vibhavadipratipadanam Tatra Tatra Svabhidhanam Antarenapi Rasadinam Pratitih*; *Yatra Yatra Vibhavadyapratipadanam Tatra Tatra Svabhidhanasadbhave Pi Rasadinam Apratitisca.*

From the above discussion relating to the apprehension of Rasadis, the following conclusions from the Dhvanivadins' standpoint may be adduced:–

1. There is no Vacyatva of Rasadis through Svasabdaniveditatva.

2. Nor can Rasadis be regarded as expressed through Janyajanakabhava or Anumapyanumapakabhava conceived as subsisting between them and Vibhavadis.

3. Rasadis are only suggested by the Vibhavadis which are presented through Abhidhavyapara from words denoting them.

It may be noted that although Alokakara has controverted only the first (Svasabdaniveditatvena vacyatvam) of the Purvapaksas raised, it is far from his mind to support the Vacyatva of Rasadis through Vibhavadipratipadana. He agrees no doubt with the view that Rasadipratiti is effected through Vibhavadipratipadana but refutes the Vacyatva of Rasadis contended either through Janyajanakabhava or Anumapyanumapakabhava between Rasadis and Vibhavadis. The Dhvanivadin repudiates also the opinion advanced by some that the purpose of Dhvanana is served by Tatparyasakti. Against the up-holders of the Tatparyasakti, it may be said that it will be useful only in places where Samsarga or Bheda could be observed. With regard to Rasa, the soul of which is relishabiability, the Tatparyasakti will be of no avail. c.f. *Vibhavanubhavapratipadake hi vakye Tatparyasaktirbhede samsarge va paryavasyet. Na tu rasyamanatasare rase.*[76]

In establishing the Vyangyatva of Rasa etc., Anandanavardhana sets forth before us the views of the ancient school of rhetoricians as Purvapaksa. Udbhata and others who do not accept Vyanjanavyapara hold that Rasadis always occur in poetry in an expressed state. Examples of poetry in which there is the cognisance of Rasa etc. are regarded by them as figures of speech known as Rasavadalankara etc. Udbhata will be seen to have recognised the Vacyatva of Rasa as being brought by one or all combined or partially combined of Svasabdas (sentiments themselves in their own name), Sthayibhavas (permanent feelings such as love etc.) Sancarins (desultory mental conditions such as Nirveda, Glani, etc.) and Vibhavas (causes of sentiments such as Kamini, Udyana, etc.) and Abhinayas or Anubhavas effects of sentiments such as Kataksa, Bhujaksepa, etc.)

cf. *Rasavaddarsitaspastasrngaradirasodayam*
*Svasabdasthayisrngaravibhavabhinayaspadam,*[77]

The Purvapaksa of the Vacyatva of Rasadis as set forth in the portion of the Aloka *Vacyatavam Tasya Svasabdaniveditatvenava*

76. Locana
77. Locana

*Syat, Vibhavadipratipadanamukhena Va* is thus obviously based upon the contention of Udbhata and others. The two main points that would arise out of the Siddhanta of Alankarika school will be the Vacyatva of Rasadis through Svasabdanivedana or the Vacyatva of Rasadis through Vibhavadipratipadana. The examples quoted by Udbhata for Rasavadalankara etc. arising through Svasabda-niveditatva etc. are not calculated to prove the Vacyatva of Rasadis in view of the fact that no Anvayavyapti Vyatirekavyapti could be found in support of the argument advanced by them. In the verses,

*Iti Bhavayatastasya Samastan Parvatigunan*
*Sambhrtanalpasankalpah Kandarpah Prabalo Bhavat*
*Svidyatapi Sa Gatrena Babhara Pulakotkaram*
*Kadambakalikakosakesaraprakaropamam*
*Ksanamautsukyagarbhinya Cintaniscalaya Ksanam*
*Ksanam Pramodalasaya Drsasyasyamabhusyata*[78]

cited by Udbhata, Abhilasasrngara is cognised neither through Svasabdas i.e., words like Kandarpah denoting the Sthayibhava namely Rati nor through the words like Autsukya, Cinta, and Pramoda denoting the Sancaribhavas. Nor is the Rasa presented through the Sabdas expressing the Anubhava as Sveda and Pulaka or through the words like Parvati and Bhavana denoting the Alambanavibhava, and Uddipanavibhava respectively. As has been said before, the Srngararasa is only suggested through Vibhavadipratipadana here. It is neither the Svasabda nor Vibhavadipratipadana that is expressive of the sentiment in places like this. Svasabda itself will be of no avail in the matter of presenting the Rasa. The Vibhavadis have no doubt an important part to play in Rasapratiti. But the Siddhantin does not see his way to believe the Purvapaksin that Rasadis are expressed through Vibhavadis. On the other hand he is for regarding that the Vibhavadis forming the Vacyartha only go to suggest the Rasadis.

*Vacyena ......... Darsayisyate*. The Rasadirupartha which is different from Vacyartha is cognised as if simultaneously with the Vacyartha. This point will be clear in the second Udyota. It may be noted that Rasadis are all treated as Asamlaksyakramavyangya which forms one of the main two divisions of Vivaksitanyaparavacyadhvani. The very word Asamlaksyakramavyangya tells

78.

us that the order of the cognisance of Vacya and Vyangya is imperceptible in that type. The word Iva in Saheva shows that although the Vyangyartha follows in the wake of Vacyartha in reality, the one arises so close to the other in such a way that the order of their presentation is unobserved. The view that Rasadis are Vacya may have probably arisen at this apparent simultanity of the cognisance of Vibhavadis and Rasa.

4. The Kavyatmatva of Pratiyamanartha

The Anyatva of Pratiyamanartha from Vacyartha was established in the Karika *Pratiyamanam etc.* and in the Vrtti following the same. Now is pointed out the Kavyatmatva of Pratiyamanartha which was referred to in the first Karika *Kavyasyatma Dhvaniriti etc.*

*Sa Evarthah.* The antecedent of Tacchabda is the Pratiyamanartha mentioned in the previous Karika. The Dhvanivadins consider that it is only the Pratiyamana part of the sense which latter has been shown to fall generally into two divisions, viz. Vacya and Pratiyamana that could form the soul of poetry. The view of the Alankara school of rhetoricians with regard to the soul of poetry is that it forms nothing but a sense which is Sahrdayaslaghya. According to this belief, there would be Kavyatmatva for Vacyartha also. Since Dhvanivadin is for attributing Kavyatmatva to Pratiyamanartha alone, the Evakara is used. It may here be noted that from the Dhvanivadin's standpoint, Sabda together with the Vacya portion of Artha constitutes the body of poetry while the Pratiyamana portion of Artha forms the soul.

Locanakara interprets Sah in *Sa Evarthah* as referring to Rasadirupartha and not to Pratiyamanartha in general. This he does on the strength of the topic discussed in the Vrttigrantha immediately preceding the Karika and the nature of the Itihasa drawn attention to in the Karika. It will be remembered that it was the third division of Pratiyamanartha viz. Rasadhvani that formed the topic of discussion in the concluding portion of the Vrttigrantha. The Itihasa also concerned with Rasa. In the opinion of Locanakara, Rasa alone deserves to be regarded as the soul of poetry. The other divisions of Pratiyamanartha, viz. Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani have their final rest in Rasadhvani. Atmatva of Kavya is attributed to Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani is only because of their superiority over Vacyartha. Cf. *Tena Rasa Eva*

*Vastuta Atma Vastvalankaradhvani Tu Sarvatha Rase Paryavasyete Iti Vacyadutkrstau Tavityabhiprayena Dhvanih Kavyasyatmeti Samanyenoktam.*[79]

Against the interpretation of Locanakara, it may be said that Vrttigrantha which follows the Karika does not in any way help as in construing that Rasadirupartha alone is intended by the word Sah. On the other hand the Vrtti only repeats the very same expressions in the Karika with regard to the portion under consideration Cf. *Sa Evarthah Sarabhutah.*[80] Further the Vrttikara points out clearly that the citation of an Itihasa having its fundamental bearing on Rasa is only in consideration of the comparative importance of Rasadidhvani and that therefore it should be taken as an Upalaksana of the other varieties of Pratiyamanartha, viz. Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani. cf. *Pratiyamanasya Canyaprabhedadarsanepi Rasabhavamukhenaivopaliaksanam Pradhanyat.*[81] Hence the nature of the Itihasa cannot be argued to be in favour of Locanakara's explanation.

*Tatha Ca.* In support of the contention that Pratiyamanartha forms the soul of poetry, the tradition relating to the origin of the first Sloka is drawn attention to. The belief is it is Valmiki's sorrow at the sight of one of a Kraunca pair shot down by a hunter that was mainly responsible for making him compose the verse *Ma Nisada Pratistham Tvam Etc.* Out of Valmiki's identifying himself with the male bird subject to untold grief at the impending separation from his mate, Valmiki must have experienced in his heart a permanent feeling of tenderness. As a result of this, sorrow being subsequently chewed in his heart; poetic words may have emanated from him. The life breath of the Sloka of the first poet could thus be seen to be Soka, the Sthayibhava of Karunarasa.

*Krauncadvandvaviyogotthah.* The disjunction of the Kraunca pair was caused by the wounding of the male bird by a hunter. The Viyoga of the two birds which were excessively devoted to one another ever since they were brought together as mates occurring as it does quite unexpectedly at a time when their zest for life had

79. Locana.
80. Aloka.
81. Aloka

not ceased, is sure to instil tender emotions into the hearts of all people who are sympathetically inclined. The intensity of the Viyoga was alike both in the male and the female. The one was fatally wounded in the prime of life when many desires of his remained yet unaccomplished; the other lost her constant companion to her ever-lasting distress.

*Sokah Slokatvamagatah.* Although sorrow which is a mental condition, cannot in reality transform itself into a verse which is Sabdartharupa, it is conceived so because so because the latter arose quite close upon the former. Cf. The Nyaya '*Taduditah Sa Hi Yo Yadanantarah.*'

*Vividhavacyavacakaracanaprapancacarunah.* This word points to the nature of Kavya. Vividhatva or manifoldness of Vacya and Vacaka is brought about by diverse kinds of figures of speech. Racanaprapanca or the copius manifestation of combinations (of Vacya and Vacaka) emphasizes the necessity of the Kavya containing Sanghatanadharmas i.e Gunas. The nature of the Kavya alluded to here is that accepted by the earlier rhetoricians to whom the factors producing loveliness in poetry form only Alankaras and Gunas.

*Sarabhutah,* is explanatory of the word Atma in the Karika. It is Pratiyamanartha which forming, so to speak the life breath of poetry, differentiates it from other compositions. What accomplishes Kavyatva for a composition is therefore the existence of Pratiyamanartha.

*Sannihytasahacarivirahakatarakrauncakrandajanitah Soka Eva Slokataya Parinatah...* The reading adopted here is that found in the Nirnayasagara edition. Although other readings are met with, it is the above that fits in with the verse *Ma Nisada Pratistham Tvam Etc.* of Ramayana upon which the Itihasa is based and the evidence indicated by Valmiki himself in the verse:

*Tasmattu Mithunadekam Pumamsam Papaniscayah.*

*Jaghana Vairanilayo Nisadastasya Pasyatah.*[82] to the effect that it was the male bird that was shot down by the Nisada. The

82. Valmikiramayana.

very words *Avadhih Kamamohitam* undoubtedly go to show that it was the woeful plight of the love-striken male bird that evoked feelings of commisseration in the poet's heart. It is not the mere Pranihanana that filled the poet's heart with abundant sorrow. What seems to have been responsible for throwing the poet into a paroxysm of distress is mainly the particular love-striken state of the male bird. Even a sago who perceives the transcient nature of all mundane things and human relations is sure to be touched deeply by the separation of a lover from his sweet heart ever devoted to him of such a pathetic nature as the one described above. Kanva is seen to observe in Sakuntala that even thought he be an ascetic devoid of all attachments, feels that his heart is sitten with anguie and his senses paralysed with anxiety at the parting of Sakuntala. On the strength of the qualifying epithet, *Kamamohitam,* to the male bird it may be reasonably argued that the sorrow which took possesssion of Valmiki's heart had the Pumskraunca as the Alambanavibhava and his lamentations etc. as the Anubhava. In the light of the above discussion *Sannihitasahacariv irahakatarakrauncakrandajanitah Sokah Eva Slokataya Parinatah* is to be interpreted as follows:-*Sannihitah Asannah Sahacarivirahah Sahacaryah Preyasyah Viyogah Tena Katarah Vihvalah Yah Krauncah Alambanavibhava Bhutah Tasya Akrandah Rodanam Anubhavah Tasmat Janitah Taccarvanaya Muneh Hrdayam Anupravistah Yah Sokah Karunarasasthayibhavah' Sa Eva Slokatam Pratipannah.*

Didhitikara is seen to reject the reading Sannihita-Sahacari etc. He is in favour of the reading beginning with Mihata. Besides he has Sahacara for Sahacari, and Kraunca-Kranda for Karauncakranda which amendation is unsupported by any other authority. According to him, Virahakataratva and Akranda concern the female Kraunca. When we consider the Sabhiprayatva of the adjective Kamamohitam of Valmiki's verse, the interpretation does not seem to be acceptable.

Upalocanakara is inclined to think that the elucidation Sahacarihananodbhutena Sahacaryudhvamsanena found in the Locana under the explanation of the word Krauncadvandvaiyogotthah and the Anuvada of the Locana portion Sahacarihanana occurring in the Kaumudi have resulted from scribal blunder or so proceeding from a misconception. He therefore gives a new interpretation

of the Aloka accepting the reading *Nihatasahacarivirahakatarakrauncakrandajanitah* etc. Cf.*Nihatah Sahacarivirahakatarah Krauncah, Vibhavah, Akrandascanubhavah, Tabhyam Janitah - Iti.*[83] From the amendation that Upalocaeakara would suggest for *Nisadanihatasahacarikam Krauncayuvanam Karunakrenkaraya Gira-Krandantam Udiksya Sokavan Slokam Ujjagada* of Rajasekhara to *Nis adanihatasahacarikam Krauncayuvanam, Kqrunakrenkaraya Gira Ca Krauncim Krandantim Udiksya* etc. It would appear that he (Upalocanakara) is for construing the Anubhava to be the lamentation of the female Kraunca and not that of the male Kraunca. It is a matter for consideration whether the Anubhava lamentation could not be taken as relating to the male Kraunca which was shown to be the Vibhava. The portion *Tathabhutavibhavatadutthakran dadyanubhavacarvanaya*[84] etc. of the Locana goes to indicate clearly that the lamentation referred to is only that of the Kraunca who is Vibhava.

Pandit Sri Mahadevasastri in his Divyanjana notes on Dhvanyaloka rejecting the amendation of Didhitikara and the resolution of the compound Nihatasahacarivirahakatarakrauncakrandajanitah suggested by the Upalocanakara tries to justify that the Hanana referred to is that of the Sahacari. He thinks that Hanana in *Avadhih Kamamohitam* should be interpreted on the strength of the suggestive power of words to mean *Vadhadapi Adhikapidaprapana.* Against this view it may be said that either the Karika portion *Krauncadvandvaviyogotthah* or the Vrtti *Nihatasahacarivirahakatarakrauncakrandajanitah* cannot be argued to depend for their Arthabodha upon the Vyangyartha of the nature pointed out. The poet's sorrow which has given rise to Sloka is undoubtedly brought about by his scening the Vyadha shooting down the male Kraunca and the reflections and emotions that pervaded the poet's heart subsequent to the incident. The Vyangyartha therefore cannot in any way be helpful in justifying the existing reading in the Aloka or the Locana.

The logical coherance between the Drstantavakya *Sokah slokatvamagatah* and the Atmatva of Pratiyamanartha in poetry

83. Upalocana.

84. Locana

which is attempted to be established in the Karika is elucidated by the Vrtti *Soko Hi Karunarasasthayibhavah*. The Soka which is observed to have transformed itself into Sloka is of a nature of a durable state of mind capable of bringing the Karunarasa to a full relishability. Soka and similar feelings always lie dormant in human minds only to be awakened under favourable conditions. They are made palatable by their being constantly chewed in the mind along with the mental conditions called into being by their respective Vibhavadis. Soka of the above description is not very much different from Karunarasa. It is the Sthyaibhava raised to a state of relishability that culminates in Rasa.

cf. *Vibhavairanubhavaisca Sattvikairvyabhicaribhih*
*Aniyamanah Svadutvam Sthayi Bhavo rasah smrtah.*[85]

The lines of the Aloka make it distinctly clear that Soka in the Karika should not be construed as worldly sorrow but should be understood as Karunarasabhinnasthayibhava. The Soka attaining to a stage of Rasyamanatva which is identical with Karun falls under Rasadilaksanartha, the third variety which was alreday shown to exist always as Pratiyamanarupa only. Cf. *Tasmadanvayavyatirekabhyam Abhidheyasamarthyaksiptatvameva Rasadinam, Na Tvabhidheyatvam Kathamcid...*[86] Thus the Itihasa relating the transformation of Soka into Sloka will be seen to be quite relevant in as much as it helps to establish the view that Pratiya manartha forms the soul of poetry.

For the process of the feelings lying hidden naturally in the mind assuming relishable states and the identicalness conceived between Sthayibhava and Rasa cf. *Vyavaharadasayam Savsminnatmani Samviditam Idanim Vilapadilkaryadarsanat Parasminnanumiyate ; Tadanantaram Samskarodbodhah, Tadanantaram Nirmalataya Hrdayasya Samvadah.* The Karika *Kavyasyatma* etc. which latter according to them establishes the Kavyatmatva of Rasadis only, they hold that Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani do not, in reality, possess Kavyatmatva and that these two shine in poetry only by being an accessory to Rasa, Bhava, etc. since Vastu and Alankara have their final rest

85. Dasarupaka
86. Aloka

in Rasadis. In places where Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani do not have their final cessation in Rasadis, their Jivitatva-vyavahara, they would argue as proceeding from Anyasab-davailaksanyakaritva. of. *Svarupamatraparyavasanabhavakrtam Hi Rasaparyasanam. Tathabhave Sati Yadyati Jivitatvam Anucitam, Tathapi Rasadidhvanigatanyasabdavail akasanya-karitvagunayogad Aupacarikam Jivitatvam Na Mukhyamityar-thah.*[87]

Kavyatmatva for all varieties of Pratiyamanartha has to be understood to exist on the analogy of that Rasadirupartha on which the Itihasa is based. Anyaprabhedadarsanepi does not refer to the three divisions of Pratiyamanartha in the form of Vastu, Alankara and Rasa pointed out by the Vrttikara under the Karika *Pratiyamanam* etc. It may be noted that the classification of Pratiyamanartha attempted by the Karikakara has not for its fundamental basis the above three-fold distinctions. He begins with Avivaksitavacya and Vivaksitanyaparavacya and enumerates their numerous subdivisions. On an analysis of his classification, the Vrttikara observes that suggestion could take one of the form of Vastu, Alankara or Rasadis. Such a generalisation seems to have been made by the Vrttikara only for facilitating him to establish the existence of a sense altogether different from the expressed sense. Hence the varieties the Vrttikara has in his mind when he says Anyaprabhedadarsanepi, are those detailed in the portions of the Karikagrantha to follow.

The meaning of the line *Pratiyamanasya Canyaprabheda-darsanepi Rasabhavamukhenaivopalaksanam* will therefore be:- *Pratiyamanasyarthasya Rasabhavadibhyo Vyatirikta Anyepi Pra-bheda Darsayisyante. Tesamapi Kavyatmatvam 'Kavyasyatma Sa Evarthah' Ityatra Pratipipadayisitam. Udahrtetihasena Prati-yamanarthesu Pradhanabhutasya Rasabhavadiprabhedasya Kaya-tmatvam Vyavasthapitam. Rasabhavadinetaresamapi Prabhedanam Kavyatmatvam Upalaksate. Evanca Rasabhavadinam Kavyatma-tvasadhaka Itihasonyesamapi Pratiyamanarthaprabhedanam Kavyatmartvasyopalaksakah.*

87. Kaumudi

*Sarasvati.........Pratibhavisesam.* In this Karika, the author draws attention to the Laksya of Pratiyamanartha and its supreme importance in poetry. Partiyamanartha is to be found in the words of great poets. It occupies a prominent position in poetry since the words pregnant with it reveal the poet's superior artistic genius of a non-worldly character. The comparison conceived appears to be that between Sarasvati (speech) and the River Sarasvati which is represented in legends as flowing underground Locanakara believes that what is suggested here is Sadharmya between poet's speech and a cow. Nisyandamana, he would explain as *Divyam Anandarasam Svayameva Prasnuvana.*[88] In this connection he quotes the verse:-

*Vagdhenurdugdha Ekam Hi Rasam Yadbalatrsnaya*
*Tena Nasya samah Sa Syadduhyate Yogibhirhi Yah.*

of Bhattanayaka wherein Dhenutva is metaphorically described with reference to words. But it may be said that speech effusing suggested sense which is ever manifested in a concealed manner is better likened to the Sarasvati River of underground flow than to a cow. Cf. the Kosa:- *Sarasvati Nadibhede Girvagdevatayorapi* and also the verse:-

*Adrsyamana Kvacidiksita Kvacin*
*Mamanuyoge Bhavatah Sarasvati*
*Kvacitprakasam Kvacidasphutarnasam*
*Sarasvatim Jetumanah Sarasvatim*

of Sri Harsa comparing speech with the River Sarasavati.

*Tadarthavastu* refers to Pratiyamanarupam Arthavastu.

*Nihsyandamana* should be understood to have a causative sense. It therefore means Nihsyandayanti.

*Alokasamanya.........Pratibhavisesam.* What is disclosed by expressions containing Pratiyamanartha is the Pratibhavisesa of the great poet. Pratibha is that brilliant quality which forms the material cause of all poetic genius. Vamana defines it as *Kavitvabijam Pratibhanam.*[89] The Pratibha revealed by words brimming

88. Locana.

89. Kavyalankarasutras, I, 3, 16.

with Partiyamanartha of great poets is not of the ordinary type but of a highly distinguished character. The peculiar poetic talent of a supermundane nature gleans forth only when there is to be found in words Pratiyamanartha of the above description and not when there is a mere combination of words and senses or a stringing together of words and tenses embellished by Alankaras and Gunas only. Thus the importance of Pratiyamanartha proceeding from its superiority over Vacyartha is made clear.

*Vastutattvam Nihsyandamana.* All editions read Vastutattvam as one word. But it seems that Tattvam forms only an explanation of the portion Vastu of the compound Tadarthavastu of the Karika. Reference to Pratiyamanarthaas a Vastu will be found to have been made previously in the text *Pratiyamanam Punaranyadeva Vastvasti Vanisu Mahakavinam*'. All the readings follow the interpretation of Locanakara who construes Vastutattvam as one word and explains it as *Vastusabdenarthasabdam Tattvasabdena Ca Vastussabdam Vyacaste* in a rather far-fetched way.

*Yena.* The antecedent of Yad is the Pratibhavisesa mentioned as shining forth brilliantly. The Pratibhavisesa is here shown to be the Nimitta in the matter of determining the greatness of poets.

It may be noted that the Vrttikara goes against the spirit of the Karika when he deduces from it a conclusion to the effect *Yenasminnativicitrakavi Paramparavahini Samsare Kalidasaprabhrtayo Dvitrah Pancasa Va Mahakavaya Iti Ganyante* which emphasizes more the rarely of great poets than the Laksyabhuyastva and the importance of Pratiyamanartha intended to be indicated in the Karika. Such a conclusion will be defeating the very purpose of the author who wants establish to the existence of Dhvani which latter could be, in his opinion, largely met with in all good poetry. The question of Mahakavitvaganana considered by the Vrttikara is not in any way directly helpful to the elucidation of establishment of the thesis attempted to be set forth by the Karikakara.

*Idam Caparam...........Pramanam.* This portion of the Vrtti forms an introduction to the Karika *Sabdarthasasana-*......etc. which immediately follows. In the opinion of Locanakara, the

Pramana the Vrttikara wishes to point out as set forth in the Karika is Bhinnasamagrivedyatva. The Bhinnasamagrivedyatva consists in the Vacyartha being cognized by a mere knowledge of Sabdarthasasana while the Partiyamanartha by an understanding of the realities of the essential principle in poetry.

But the purpose indended to be served by the Karika seems however to explain how the Pratiyamanartha is cognized. When once the existence of Pratiyamanartha is recognised and its difference from Vacyartha is established, the question that naturally arises is how it is perceived. The Anyatva of Pratiyamanartha was pointed out in the Karika *Pratiyamanam.........* etc. Subsequently its Kavyatmatva was discussed in the Karika *Kavyasyatma* ... etc. What follows now is a consideration of the cognizance of Pratiyamanartha. We can say for certain that Pratiyamanartha will never be Sabdarthasasanajnanamatravedya and that it will be always Kavyarthatattvajnanamatravedya.

*Sabdarthasasanajnanamatrena.* Sabdarthasasana means teachings concerning Sabda and Artha as Sabdalankaras, Arthalankaras, Sabdagunas, Arthagunas, etc. The reference is to the detailed study of Vacya and Vacaka as embodied in the works of Bhamaha, Udbhata, etc. Cf.

> *Tatra Vacyah Prasiddho Yah Prakarairupamadibhih*
> *Bahudha Vhakrtah So Nyaih Kavyalaksmavidhayibhih.*[90]

In Dhvanikara's view all that has been said about Vacya and Vacaka does not help us in any way in knowing the Pratiyamanartha.

The interpretation *Kevalena Sabdasadhakarthavyutpadakavyakaranakosajnanena*[91] for Sabdarthasasanajnanamatrenaiva given by Didhitikara will be seen to be irrelevant since the distinction sought to be drawn is obviously between the Alankaradis and the Pratiyamanartha.

The word *Eva* of the Purvardha is to be connected with *Na Vedyate* as *Na Vedyate Eva*. The Anvaya of the Uttarardha will be *Sa Kevalam Kavyarthatattvajnaireva Vedyate Hi.*

90. Dhvanyaloka.

91. Didhiti.

What is emphasized by the Karika is that the Pratiyamanartha is perceived only by men of taste who have the capacity to perceive the essential truth of poetry. It will be noted that the work itself is undertaken with a view to elucidating the nature of Dhvani having the Pratiyamanartha as its life-principle.

*Sabdarthasasana......Tatpratitih Syat.* Vrttikara construes the Karika as proving the Anyatva of Pratiyamanartha from Vacyartha. For this he argues that if the Pratiyamanartha could be brought under Vacyartha, its cognizance could be had by Vacyavacakasvarupaparijnana. As this does not occur and as the Pratiyaman artha unfolds itself only to Kavyarthatattvajna, the fact that it is different from the vacyartha is quite evident.

*Atha ca vacya...... Evasavarthah.* In drawing attention to the non-perceivability of the Pratiyamanartha by persons who only care to study the descriptions of Vacya and Vacaka, an analogy is cited. Kavyatattvarthabhavanavimukhanam form only an explaof suffix nation of Vacyavacakalaksanamatrakrtasramanam. It is the force Matrac that is brought out in the explanatory expression. What stands in the Upamanavakya against Vacyavacakalaksanamatrakrtasramanam is Gandharvalaksanavidam. Gandharvalaksanavids are those who have understood the Laksyas as per Laksanas discussed in the scientific works on music. If an elucidation of word Gandharvalaksanavidam is to be given as in the Upameya vakya, it will be Sangitatattvarthasvadanavimukhanam. It is this idea that is intended to be brought out by the expression Apragitanam in the text of the Vrtti.

*Svarasrutyadilaksanamiva Apragitanam.* The word Apragitanam is to be dissolved as *Prakrstam Gitam yesam te pragitah. Pragita na Bhavantiti Apragitah. Tesam Apragitanam* and means literally *Avidyamanaprakrstagitanam.* However, on the strength of the context, the word has to be taken to mean here as *Aparoksapra krstagitatattvanam* i. e. 'of those who have failed to perceive the inner realities of excellent songs. Svarasrutyadilaksanam must be taken to stand against Pratiyamanartharupam Vastu. The exact nature of svaras, srutis, etc. is not perceived by one merely versed in Sangitasastra. For a proper knowledge of the same what is required is an appreciative bent of mind.

Svara is defined as:-

*Srutyawantarabravi Yah Snigdho Nuranantmakah*
*Svano Ranhjayaati Srotuscittam Sa Svara Ucyate.*[92]

Svaras are seven in number beginning with Sadja. Cf.

*Sadjasca Rsabhascaiva Gandharo Madhyamastatha*
*Pancamo Dhaivatascaiva Nisadah Sapta Te Svarah.*[93]

Sruti is explained in the Sangitasastra as:-

*Prathamasravanaccnabdah Sruyate Hrasvamatrakah*
*Sa Srutih Samparijneya Svaravayavalaksana.*[94]

Twenty-two of these are enumerated, four constituting a major tone, three a minor and two a semi-tone. Cf.

*Catuscatuscatuscaiva Sadjamadhyamapancamah*
*Dve Dve Nisadagandharau Tristrirrsabhadhaivatau.*[95]

What is denoted by the word Adi is explained by Locanakara a *Adigrahanena Jatyamsakagramaragabhasavi Bhasantarabhasa-desimarga Grhyante.*

Didhitikara rejects the reading *Apragitanam* on the ground that it is irrelevent. But it will be evident from the elucidations above, the expression *Apragitanam* fits in very well with the context in as much as it balances with *Kavyatattvarthabhavanavi-mukhanam* of the Upameyavakya.

*Evam Vacyavyatirekino vyangyasya......Pradarsayati.* Loca-nakara explains *Evam* as Svarupabhedena, Visayabhedena and Bhinnasamagrivedyatvena. Probably he is of opinion that these three are dealt with in the Karikas *Pratiyamanam* ......etc., *Sara-svati Svadu*...... etc. and *Sabdarthasasana*......etc. respectively.[96] But it has already been pointed out that the Karikas in questio- are intended to acquaint us with: (i) *Vacyavyatirekino Vyangyasy-arthasya Sadbhavah*, (2) *Vyangyasyarthasya Laksyabhuyastvam*, and (3) *Vyangyasyarthasya Kavyarthatattvjnaikavedyatvam* in order.

92. Sangitaratnakara.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid
95. Sangitaratnakara
96. Dhvanyaloka

According to Vrttikara, what is discussed in the following Karika is the pre-eminence of the Vyangyartha itself. But the purpose of the Karika seems to be to indicate the special effort required in the matter of ascertaining the Vyanjakasabda and Vyanjakartha of great poets. While a study of Alankaras, Gunas, etc. will suffice to enable one to understand the manifold varieties of Vacakasabdas and Vacyarthas, an additional effort in the form of Kavyatattvarthabhavana is essential for detecting the Vjyanaka-sabdas and Vyanjakarthas. Thus the fact that Sabdas and Arthas suggestive of a different sense could be discerned with a particular kind of effort is the point that is stressed in the Karika that follows.

*So Rthastadvyakti......Mahakaveh.* Tadvyaktisamarthyayogi is to be connected with both Artha and Sabda. The pronoun Tad in the compound has Vyangyartha referred to in the previous Karikas as its antecedent. It has to be noted that Vyanjakatva exists both in the case of Sabda and Artha as is made clear in the Karika defining Dhvani. Cf.

> *Yatrarthah Sabdo Va Tamarthamupasarjanikrtasvarthau*
> *Vyanktah Kavyavisesah Sa Dhvanirit Suribhih Kathithah.*

*Pratyabhijneyau*, he seems to take as construed by Locanakara in the sense of *Pratyabhijnatum Arhau.* Cf. *Pratyabhijneya Vityarharthe Krtyah.*[97]

It will be better to take the Anvaya as *Mahakaveh Tau Sabdarthau Yatnatah Pratyabhijneyau* and construe the meaning of the lines as:- 'That word and that sense which are Vyanjakas, of a great poet are capable of being perceived with effort.' Partyabhi-jneyau will be seen to mean Pratyabhijnatum Sakyau, the Krtya-pratyaya being used in Sakyartha.

*Na Sabdamatram.* Kascana qualifying Sebdah shows that the Sabda referred to is not Kevalasabda but Visistasabda i. e. Vyanjakasabda.

*Mahakaveh Praty bhijneyau* in the Vrtti is to be explained as *Mahakavisambandhinau Iti Sahrdayaih Pratyabhijneyau.* Locana-kara has the elucidation *Yo Mahan Kaviraham Bhuyasam Ityasaste*

97. Locana

under Mahakaveh of the Vrtti. It seems that he is for considering Mahakaveh as Kartari sasthi. The meaning, therefore, according to him will be *Mahakavitvam Asasanena Pratyabhijneyau.*

*Vyangyavyanjakabhyameva......Matrena.* This is given in the Vrtti as a corollary of the Karikartha.

Herein Vrttikara will be found to lose sight of the *Yatnatah Pratyabhijneyatvam* of the Vyanjakasabdas and Vyanjakarthas desired to be pointed out in the Karika.

*Idanim......Yuktamevetyaha.* In this introduction, the propriety of the poet's paying attention to the Vacya and Vacaka before considering the Vyangya and Vyanjaka in spite of the fact that between the two pairs the latter is the more important, is pointed out as the topic discussed in the Karika that follows. As construed by Vrttikara with regard to the previous Karika, here also the Kartrtva of the action is attributed to the poet. It was observed in the Vrtti to the previous Karika that the Pratyabhijnana of Sabda and Artha was to be on the part of the poet. Similarly the Adarana of Vacyartha is mentioned here to be with reference to the poet. It may however be said that both here and in the former instance, the agent is none other than the Kavyarthatattvajna i. e. man of taste already referred to in the Karika *Sabdarthasasana......*etc. The fact that it is the value of the Vacaka and Vacya, Vyanjaka and Vyangya from the stand point of the Sahrdayas is the thing intended to be discussed is evidenced also by the Karika *Tadvat Sacetasam......*etc. It is only the Sahrdaya who searches for the Vyangyartha that considers at the outset the Vacyartha. Even for him, the Vacyartha forms only an Upaya in the matter of his cognizing the Vyangyartha. Illustration of the Dipasikhavisayakayatna with regard to a person desirous of seeing things in darkness will be found to apply aptly to the Upayopeyabhava discussed here.

*Tadupayataya.* In the Drstantapaksa this would mean *Alokopayataya* while in the Darstantikapaksa, it would mean *Pratiyamanarthopayataya.*

*Artho Vacyastadadrtah.* All editions prefer the reading *Arthe Vacye Tadadrtah.* The meaning of *Tadadrtah* will then be *Vyangyarthadarayuktah* i. e. Sahrdayah. Further *Yatnavan*

(Bhavati) will have to be read in the Darstantikavakya also as *Tadadrtah Tadupayataya Vacye Arthe Yatnavan Bhavati.* The reading *Artho Vacyastadadrtah* will be found to fit in better with *Vacyavacakaveva Prathaman Upadadate Kavayah* of the introduction. It is perhaps *Vacye Rthe Yatnavan Bhavati* of the Vrtti portion that has given rise to the reading *Arthe Vacye* etc. The Vrttikara has only recast the construction in order to present to advantage the Drstantavakya and the Darstantikavakya. The point that Vrttikara stresses as has been already noticed is *Vyangyarthasya Pradhanyepi Vacyarthe Yatnavan Bhavati Tadupayataya.* And what he establishes is that there cannot be pre-eminence for Vacyartha in as much as it is only a means to the cognizance of the Vyangyartha. The Karikakara's intention is to draw attention to the Upayopeyabhava between the Vacyartha and Vyangyartha like that subsisting between the flame of the lantern and seeing. It is thus the exclusive devotion of the Vacyartha to the Vyangyartha that is to be emphasized by the Karikakara. The Anvaya of the reading *Artho Vacyastadadrthah* adopted here will be *Vacyah Arthah Tadadrtah* (Sahrdayadrtah) *Bhavati.*

*Anena......Darsayitumaha.* This portion explains the connection between the Purvakarika and the Uttarakarika as conceived by the Vrttikara. The fact that the effort of the Pratipadaka i.e the poet is concerned with the Vyangyartha has been demonstrated in the Karika *Alokarthi* ...... etc. Now the effort of the Pratipadya i. e. the person who is intended to be instructed is also shown to be about the same. It may, however, be said that there does not arise the question of connecting one with the Pratipadaka and the other with the Pratipadya in as much as both are concerned with the relation of Vacya and Vyangya from the standpoint of the Sahrdaya. In the previous Karika it was mentioned that Vacyartha is the Upaya of the Vyangyarthavagama. What is next pointed out is that Vyangyarthapratiti is preceded by Vacyarthapratiti.

*Tasya Vastunah*, of the Karika means *Pratiyamanasya Arthasya.*

Just as Padarthapratiti is the medium of Vakyarthapratiti, the Vacyarthapratiti is the medium of Vyangyarthapratiti. It may be noted that in the third Uddyots when considering the relation subsisting between Padartha and Vakyartha, Vrttikara draws

attention to two views one that of the Vaiyakaranas who contend that Padarthapratiti is untrue and another that of the Mimamsakas who hold that there is Padarthapratiti. According to the latter view it is the relation of Ghata and its Upadanakarana that bears analogy to Vakyarthapratiti and Padarthapratiti. When once the Ghata takes its shape, the material causes that go into its formation are not perceived separately. Similarly when the Vacya and the Vakyartha are cognized, the Padas and the Padarthas do not show themselves separately. If there is separate perception of the constituent Padarthas at the time of Vakyarthapratiti, there will be no Vakyarthabuddhi at all. The case of Vacyarthajnana and Vyangyarthajnana is different. Even at the time of Vyangyarthapratiti, the Vacyartha is capable of being perceived separately. Hence Vrttikara thinks that it is Ghatapradipanyaya that serves to illustrate the relation of Vacya and Vyangya. Even after Ghatapratiti is accomplished there is no disappearance of Pradipaprakasa. Likewise even when the Vyangyartha is cognized, there is the manifestation of the Vacyartha. Just as the Pradipa is the illuminant of Ghata, so the Vacyartha is the Vyanjaka of the Vyangyartha The analogy between the Vacyartha and the Vyangyartha on the one hand and the Padartha and the Vakyartha on the other is in the opinion of the Vrttikara, based on Upayatvasamya. But it seems that what is desired to be drawn attention to in the Karika is only that Vacyapratiti forms a Dvara to Vyangyapratiti and Padarthaparatiti to Vakyarthapratiti. The Paurvaparya could be clearly understood to be the Sadharanadharma. Hence the justification *Yattu Prathamoddyote 'Yatha Padarthadvarena' Ityadyuktam Tadupayatvasamyamatrasya vivakśaya* does not seem to be quite in place. When the relation of Upayopeyabhava is pointed out as subsisting between Vacya and Vyangya in the Karika *Alokarthi Yatha* etc. it is the Paurvaparya of Vacyarthapratiti and Vyangyarthapratiti that is desired to be brought to our notice in the Karika *Yatha Padarthadvarena* etc.

*Idanim...Na Vyalupyate Tatha Darsayati.* Here also Vrttikara is of opinion that what is discussed in the two subsequent Karikas is the Pradhanyavyalopabhava of the Vyangyartha although its comprehension is preceded by the Vacyarthapratiti. As the importance of Vyangyartha in poetry has already been firmly established, there is no occasion to think that the question is

raised again. After illustrating the Upayopeyabhava between Vacya and Vyangya and the Paurvaparya of Vacyapratiti and Vyangyapratiti what the Karikakara does is to make clear the manner in which Vyangyartha unfolds itself to the minds of men of taste, together with the place that Vacyartha occupies at the time of Vyangyapratiti. The Vacyarthapratiti, no doubt, leads to the Vyangyarthapratiti, but as soon as it has accomplished its purpose, it is thrown into the shade as a result of which it passes unnoticed.

*Svasamarthyavasenaiva.* Sva refers to the Padartha. The Samarthya with regard to the Padarthas consists in their being possessed of expectancy (Akanksa), propriety (Yogyata) and contiguity (Sannidhi).

Vyaparanispattau. The Vyapara is the function of the Padarthas in the form of Vakyarthapratipadana.

*Vibhaktataya* has been put in the Vrtti to supplement *Na Vibhavyate* in the Karika. If Vibhaktataya forms only an explanation of the prefix VI as observed by Locanakara, the text of the Vrtti should have been *Na Vibhaktataya Bhavyate* with the meaning of VI put in front of the verb *Bhavyate.* Since Vibhaktataya occurs after the verb it is better regarded as Sesapurana. What is intended is not Sarvatha Vibhavanabhava but only Vibhaktataya Vibhavanabhava.

*So Rthah.* The Artha under consideration i.e. Vyangyartha. Balapriyakara has the meaning *Vakyartharupavacyarthah*[98] for *So rthah.*

*Vacyarthavimukhatmanam.* Men of taste are averse to Vacyartha because their attention is always riveted on the Vyangyartha.

*Buddhau Tattvarthadarsinyam.* The minds of the Sahrdayas are always alert to perceive the essential reality in poetry.

The Artha which is said to shine forth all of a sudden in the Buddhi which is characterised by Tattvarthadarsitva of men of

98. Dhvanyaloka

taste who are indifferent to the Vacyartha can only be the Vyangyartha. By saying *Vyangyo Rthah Jhatityevavabhasate* the fact *Vyangyarthanispattau Vacyartho Na Vibhavyate Vibhaktataya* would naturally follow so as to agree with the Drstantavakya. The Vyangyartha presents itself to the mind of a Sahrdaya immediately after the Vacyarthapratiti. Although there is in the process of Vyangyarthapratiti a part for the Vacyartha to play, the Vacyartha is not distinctly perceived because it retires to the background after the accomplishment of its purpose. This coupled with the suddenness of the manifestation of the Vyangyartha is responsible for Vacyarthas Vibhaktataya Vibhavanabhava.

*Jhatityevavabhasate*. The Vyangyartha reveals itself all of a sudden to the mind of the Sahrdaya because his mind does not repose on the Vacyartha averse as he is to it in his eagerness to arrive at the truth.

*Yatravabhasate*. It is the meaning of Avabhasate of the Karika that is explained by the Vrttikara as *Yatravabhasate* and Yatra is to be construed in the sense of Yatsthitataya i.e. Kavyasthitataya. The Vyangyartha may be said to exist in the Kavya since it is immediately after the Kavyaparisilana that it dawns forth in the mind of a Sahrdaya.

*Evam.........Upayojayannaha*. Before attempting the actual definition of Dhvani whose nature was promised to be enquired into at the outset the author felt the necessity of drawing attention to the Pratiyamanartha which forms so to speak, the soul of Dhvanikavya. It was therefore established with the help of proper arguments that there is in poetry a sense over and above the expressed held in estimation by men of taste. It is now shown that, that particular Kavya in which Pratiyamanartha shines forth preeminently forms Dhvani. The existence of Pratiyamanartha as distinct from Vacyartha which was discussed heretofore will thus be seen to have a bearing on the context since it naturally leads to the definition of Dhvani.

*Arthah Sabdo Va*. Artha here means the expressed sense while by Sabda is understood the word employed in poetry. *Va* is used in the sense of Ca. This is made clear by the dual forms Upasarjanikrtasvarthau and Vyanktah. Probably the fact that

sense may be suggested by Artha and Sabda individually is indicated by the particle of option. In reality, suggestion is accomplished both by Artha and Sabda together. Where Artha is more active than Sabda in suggestion, the Artha is considered to be the Vyanjaka having the Sabda as its accessory. Vyanjakatva of Sabda similarly rests with the greater prominence on the part of Sabda in the matter of suggestion. cf.

*Sabdabodhyo Vyanaktyarthah Sabdo Pyarthantarasrayah.*
*Eksaya Vyanjakatve Tadanyasya Sahakarita.*[99]

*Tam Artham.* The antecedent of Tacchabda is Pratiyamana. *Upasarjanikrtavarthau.* Upasarjanikrtah Svarthah Yabhyam Tau Upasarjanikrtasvarthau. What is meant is Artha and Sabda subordinating their own interests become devoted to the suggested sense. The idea conveyed here seems to be the same as that of Tatparau in *Tatparaveva Sabdarthau Yatra Vyangyam Prati sthitau*[100] appearing later on. This view is supported by the definition *Sabdarthau Yatra Gunibhavitatmanau Kamapyarthamabhivyanktastadadyam*[101] given to Uttamakavya by Jagannatha, wherein we find that both Sabda and Artha are mentioned as requiring alike Gunibhavitatmatva.

But in the Vrtti under *Upasarjanikrtasvarthau* of the Karika, the explanation given is *Artho Gunikrtatma, Gunikrtabhidheyasca Sabdah;*[102] Locanakara has *Svasabdah Atmavaci; Svasca Arthasca Svarthau; Tau Gunikrtau Yabhyam Yathasankhyena Tena Artho Gunikrtatma, Sabdo Gunikrtabhidheyah*[103] in keeping with the Vrttigrantha. This would come to mean that the subordination concerns itself only with Artha in all instances of Vyangyartha irrespective of the nature of the Vyanjaka in the form of Artha or Sabda. As both Sabda and Artha are accepted as Vyanjakas, there should be subordination for both in Dhvanikavya. According to the interpretation of the Vrtti and Locana quoted above, it is only Artha that is mentioned in a state of subordination.

99. Sahityadarpana
100. Dhvanyaloka
101. Rasagangadhara
102. Dhvanyaloka
103. Locana

*Kavyavisesah.* Locanakara construes Kavyavisesah not only in the sense of a kind of poetry but also in the sense of Vyangyartha, Vacyartha, Sabda or Vyapara. The applicability of the term Dhvani to these is explained by him as *Dhvanatiti Dhvanih* (with regard to Kavya, Vacyartha and Sabda), *Dhvanyate Iti Dhvanih* (with regard to Vyangyartha) and *Dhvananam Iti Dhvanih* (with regard to Vyanjanavyapara).[104] It may be noted, however, that the Karikakara means by Dhvani only the foremost of the three types of literary compositions.

The reading with Vacakavisesah preceding *Sabdo Va* which is found adapted in almost all the editions is rejected here because the Vacaktava of Sabda has apparently nothing to do with suggestion.

*Anena......... Dhvanervisaya Iti Darsitam.* From the definition of Dhvani, its difference in scope from the Alankaras and Gunas will be obvious. While Alankaras and Gunas are producers of charm to the Vacya and Vacaka which constitute the body of poetry, Dhvani forms a kind of Kavya itself.

*Yadapyuktam - 'Prasiddhaprasthanatikramino ......... Dhvanirnasti' Iti, Tadapyayuktam,* meets one of the Purvapaksas in favour of the negation of Dhvani on the strength of its non-mention by the ancients.

*Yato Laksanakrtameva......Kavyatattvam.* A thing cannot be denied on the mere fact that no definition has been attempted for it. What is required to establish the existence of anything is the search for the Laksya. When Kavyas are examined, it will be clear that there exists a particular class among them which exemplifies the characteristics specified here and which overtops all other forms of literary compositions by reason of its being a source of immense delight to the minds of men of taste. Hence Dhvani's existence cannot be denied. Kavyatattvam here is to be construed as Kavyarupam Tattvam.

*Tato Nyat......Darsayisyamah.* Any Kavya which takes its stand outside the scope of Dhvani is Citra. As the main principle

104. Locana

of suggestiveness is a common characteristic of both Dhvani and Gunibhutavyangya, they are treated here as one class when differentiating the Citrakavya from them. The nature of Citra will be found to be pointed out later as

*Pradhanagunabhavabhyam Vyangyasyaivam Vyavasthite Kavye Ubhe Tatonyadyattaccitramabhidhiyate.*[105]

*Yadapyuktam...... Kathamantarbhavah.* The view that Dhvani can be brought under Alankaradis expounded by the ancients if it be contended that Dhvani does not transgress the domain of loveliness is refuted. Perhaps what is meant by the Purvapaksin is that the kind of poetry nomenclatured Dhvani forms only a variety of the group of poetical compositions containing Alankaras etc., which are calculated to produce Carutva for them. The Siddhantin points out that the fundamental basis of a Kavya which is Alankaradipradhana is obviously different from that of Dhvani. In the former, loveliness rests with the Sabda or Artha of an expressive or an expressed character while in the latter it is the relation between the Artha and the Sabda of a suggestive nature and the sense suggested that forms the basis of Carutva.

*Vacyavacaka........... Pratipadayisyamanatvat.* Dhvani as stated above, stands outside the scope of Kavyas which are Alankaradipradhanas. Alankaras etc., which are producers of Carutva to the Vacya or Vacaka when occurring in a Dhvanikavya form only its Angas. Since Dhvani forms the Kavya in its entirety, it is Angin. The Alankaras are only Angas for the reason that they embellish the Vyangyartha which constitutes its life-principle.

*Parikaraslokah* is a verse upholding any pint set forth. *Prakrtam Artham Parikaroti Udvahatiti Parikarah.*

*Vyangyavyanjaka......Kutah.* Dhvani has for its basis the relation of Vyangya and Vyanjaka. The factors that produce Carutva to Vacya and Vacaka are Alankaradis.

*Nanu Yatra Pratiyamanasyarthasya..........Upasarjanikrtasvarthau Iti.* The purpose of Upasarjanikrtasvarthau qualifying

105. Dhvanyaloka.

Artha and Sabda in Dhvanilaksanakarika is shown to be to refute the Purvapaksa that Dhvani admits of being included in Samasokti etc., where there is the clear cognizance of Pratiyamanartha. If it be contended that Pratiyamanartha is the criterion of Dhvani, one may argue that Dhvani will come under Alankaras wherein there is the cognizance of Pratiyamanartha. In certain Alankaras, the cognizance of Pratiyamanartha is not clear. For example, in Rupaka and Utpreksa, there is no doubt an Aupamya suggested. But this Aupamya does not show itself clearly being cast into the shade by the Rupana (superimposition) and the Sambhavana (assumption) involved in them. On the other hand, in Alankaras like Samasokti, the suggested sense will be found to present itself distinctly. Perhaps it may be difficult to bring Dhvani under the former group. But Dhvani's inclusion in the latter group (Samasoktyadis) must certainly be possible in so far as there is in this a distinct manifestation of Partiyamanartha which is recognised by the Siddhantin to be the essential entity of Dhvanikavya. Although there is Pratiyamanarthapratiti in Alankaras like Samasokti, there is no subordination of Sabda and Artha to the suggested sense. Thus for the reason that Upasarjanikrtasvarthatva of the Sabda and the Artha lacks in them, they do not deserve to be considered as Dhvani. Samasoktyadis will be pointed out as coming under the Gunibhutavyangya, the second type of Kavya.

*Artho Gunikrtatma.* Vrttikara takes Gunikrtatmatva for Artha and Gunikrtabhidheyatva for Sabda. For the desirability of interpreting Upasarjanikrtasvarthau in a different way, see notes under the Karika. It is worthy to be noted in this connexion that by saying that Sabda and Artha are Upasarjanikrtasvarthas, it means they are not only in a state of subordination but also contributary to the charm of the Vyangyartha.

*Tesu Katham Tasyantarbhavah.* The pronoun Tesu denotes Samasoktyadis.

*Vyangyapradhanye...... Samasoktyadisvasti.* It is only when Vyangya has predominence, there is Dhvanitvavyavahara for a Kavya. It is not enough if there is Vyangya of some sort. In Samasokti etc. predominence is for Vacya and and not for Vyangya.

*Samasoktau Tavat.* Samasokti has been defined by Bhamaha as:

*Yatroktau Gamyate sorthastatsamanairvisesanaih*
*Sa Samasoktirudita Sanksiptarthataya Budhaih*[106]

*Upodharagena......Laksitam.* The Sloka is a description of Sayamsandhya. By the force of common epithets, there is a sense different from the one relevant to the context suggested. The Aprakrtartha is that of a lover holding up the face of his sweetheart to kiss her. The adjective Upodharaga with reference to Sasin by virtue of Slesa yields a sense applicable to a lover. The Pumstva of the word Sasin and the Stritva of the word Nisa, the word Mukha conveying the senses Agrabhaga and Vadana, the qualifying epithet Vilolataraka to Nisamukha fitting it by virtue of Slesa with the Nayikavadana and the Grahana implied in Grhitam, and the words Timiramsukam, Purah and Ragat, all are favourable to the cognizance of the Aprakrtartha.

*Ityadau Vyngyenanugatam......Vakyarthatvat.* Here although there is a sense in the form of Nayikanayakavrttanta suggested in the description of Sayamsandhya which forms the Prakrta it is only the Vacyartha beautified by the Vyangyartha that shows itself predominently. The Vyavahara in the form of Dukula-vigalananavalokanadi of a Nayika with her lover in Nisa and that in the form of Tattadrsavadanamburuhaparicumbanarambhadi of a Nayaka with his sweetheart are superimposed on Nisa and Sasin. Thus Nisasasivrttanta which forms the main subject-matter is presented here in such a way that the Vyangya appears only as hanging behind the expressed sense.

For Ekasesabhava in *Samaropitanayikanayakavyavaharayoh* cf. Locana *Nayikaya Nayake Yo Vyavaharah Sa Nisayam Samaropitah; Nayikayam Nayakasya Yo Vyavaharah Sa Ca Sasini Samaropita Iti Vyakhyane Naikasesaprasangah.*[107]

*Aksepepi Vyangya...... Mukhyam Kavyasariram.* Bhamaha defines Aksepa as:

*Pratisedha Ivestasya Yo Visesabhidhitsaya*
*Aksepa Iti Tam Santah Samsanti Dvividham Yatha*[108]

106. Kavyalankara.
107. Locana.
108. Kavyalankara.

Aksepa is the figure of speech in which an apparent negation draws towards it a certain sense. The Pratisedha possessing the power to draw towards it the other sense forms the Vacya. The cognizance of the Vacyartha is accomplished only through the help of the sense which is Aksipta. A Pratisedha in its own form will yield no relevant sense. In Aksepa the suppression of what is desired to be affirmed is of such a nature as bringing an additional emphasis or importance to the idea aimed to be made known. Hence the charm is mainly concerned with the expressed Pratisedha. For example in the illustration

*Aham Tvam Yadi Nekseya Ksanamapyutsuka Tatah*
*Iyadevastvato-nyena Kimuktenapriyena Te*[109]

given by Bhamaha, it is not the suggested sense *Aham Mriye* that is at the bottom of the charm. On the other hand charm rests with Pratisedha which draws towards it the suggested sense.

*Carutvotkarsa............Pradhanyavivaksa.* In Aksepalankara prominence to Vacya and subordination to Vyangya are attributed on the superiority or otherwise of Carutva which is accepted as the basis in the matter of the determining the Pradhanya or Apradhanya.

*Anuragavati...Samagamah.* The verse is cited in illustration of Carutvotkarsa for Vacya although there is to be found a suggested sense presented. Locanakara considers the verse as an instance of Samasokti where the importance of Vacya over Vyangya on the principle of Carutvotkarsa could be clearly perceived.[110] He further observes that the same verse could be considered as exemplifying Aksepa as defined by Vamana to the effect *Upamanaksepas-caksepah* (cf. the Vrtti *Upamanasyaksepatah Pratipattirityapi Sutrarthah*). Besides, he thinks the Vrttikara had in mind to cite a verse illustrating both Samasokti and Aksepa.[111] But an examination of the verse will show that it is an example of Aksepa only and not Samasokti. In Samasokti before the cognizance of the Vyangyartha, the Vacyartha should be definite and complete.

109. Kavyalankara.
110. Locana.
111. Ibid.

Only when the Prakrtartha is logically presented, the Vyangyartha can embellish it. For example in *Upodharagena......*etc. which was already quoted, a connected sense relating to Nisa and Sasin is obtained befoie the Vyangyartha is construed through the Visesanasamya. In *Anuragavati......*etc. the word Anuragavati qualifying Sandhya means Lauhityavati. Similarly the Purassaratva of Divasa is Kalakrta. There is no meaning in saying that union does not take place between a thing which has Lauhityavattva and a thing which has Paurvakalikatva. There is nothing strange in it to make us reflect upon the way of fate. There is Pratisedhokti to be found in the Kaimarthyapratipadana of the qualities of Sandhya and Divasa as Anuragavatitva and Purassaratva respectively when it is said *Aho Daivagatiscitra Tathapi Na Samagamah*. This Pratisedha draws towards it the Stripurusavrttanta as Upamana to the Prastutavrttanta. In this way Sadharmya could be construed between Sandhya and Nayika on the one hand and Divasa and the Nayaka on the other. By virtue of Slesa, Anuragavatitva could be attributed to Sandhya as to the Nayika and Purassaratva could be attributed to Divasa as to the Nayaka. Thus there will be propriety for the union of Sandhya and Divasa as in the case of Nayika and Nayaka. It will be seen that the verse quoted by Alokakara illustrates Aksepa as conceived by Bhamaha. This will be made clear by the following Samanvayaprakara of the Vrttivakya:-

*Tatra* Anuragavatityadyaksepodaharane *Sabdoparudharupah* Aho Daivagatiscitra Tathapi Na Samagamah Ityasmat Prakatibhutam Rupam yasya Tadrsah *Visesabhidhanecchaya* Sandhyaya Nayikaya, Divasasya Nayakena ca Saha Aupamyapratipipadayisaya *Pratisedharupah* Anuragavatitva-Purassaratvarupadharmayoh Kaimarthyavacanarupah *Yah Aksepah Sa Eva Vyangyavisesam* Sandhyaya Nayikaya, Divasasya Nayakena ca Saha Aupamyam *Aksipan* Akarsan *Mukhyam* Pradhanibhutam (Etena Arthasya Upasarjanikrtasvarthatvam Spastibhavati) *Kavyasariram.*

*Yatha ca Dipakapahnutyadau ......... Drastavyam.* In Alankaras like Dipaka and Apahnuti, there is, in a suggestive nature, the cognizance of the similarity between the Varnya and the Avarnya. Nevertheless as there is no predominance intended for the Aupamya, they do not go by the name of Upama. What strikes us as pre-eminently attractive in Dipaka, is the mention of a property

which is capable of illuminating two or more Vakyarthas. Since the Vakyarthas are thus being illuminated by the Dharma stated only once, the name Dipaka is significant. cf.

*Amuni kurvate Nvarthamasyakhyamarthadipanat.*[112]

For example, in

*Manih sanollidhah samaravijayi Hetidalitah*
*Kalasesascandrah suratamraita balavanita*
*Madaksino nagah saradi saridasyanapulina*
*Tanimna sobhante Galitavibhavascarthisu nrpah*

the property of Tanimna Sobhana or shining by thinness is mentioned in relation to several objects in such a way as to bring out similarity between the kings destitute of wealth by their munificence forming the Varnya and each of the Avarnyas beginning with a jewel ground on a whet-stone. In Apahnuti also it is the disguising of the real fact that stands out principally. The appellation of the figure of speech will thus be seen to be based on the expressed Bhutarthapahnava and not on the Aupamya which is suggested. cf. *Bhutarthapahnavadasyah kriyate cabhidha yatha.*[113]

It is the same principle underlying the nomenclature of the figures of speech mentioned above that is manifested with regard to Aksepa as well.

*Na Taya Vyapadesah.* Taya means Upamaya.

*Atrapi drastavyam,* is to be explained as Aksepepi Vyangyatvenopamayah Pratitavapi pradhanyenavivaksitatvat Na Upamaya vyapadesah; Kintu Aksepah Iti Samjnaya Eva Iti Vilokaniyam.

*Anuktanimittayamapi Visesoktau.........Carutvanispattiriti Na Pradhanyam.* In Visesokti too, predominance for Vyangya is impossible to be established. The Visesokti referred to by the Vrttikara is the second of the two varieties mentioned by Udbhata. cf.

*Darsitena Nimittena Nimittadarsanena Ca*
*Tasya Bandho Dvidha Laksye Drsyate Lalitatmakah.*[114]

112. Kavyalankara.
113. *Ibid.*
114. Kavyalankarasangraha.

In *Ahutopi Sahayairemityuktva......*etc. the reason why Sankocasithilikarana did not happen, is not expressed although factors favouring the Sankocasithilikarana are present. This kind of setting forth of the non-production of effect in the existence of favourable factors without mentioning the reason responsible for such a state of affairs is an instance of Anuktanimittavisesokti. The non-mention of the cause is done with a view to establish some peculiarity. cf. the definition:-

*Yatsamagryepi Saktinam Phalanutpattibandhanam*
*Visesasyabhidhitsatadvisesoktirucyate.*[115]

In the example under discussion, the Nimitta is suggested through the force of the context. When it is known to us that the person concerned is a Pathika i.e. a wayfarer subject to the pangs of separation from his sweetheart, the reason for the non-production of Sankocasithilikarana will suggest to us to be an expectation on his part to enjoy the union with his beloved at least in his dreams. The importance in the Sloka rests mainly with the Visesokti embodied in Sankocam Naiva Sithilayati and not with the Vyangya in the form of Nimitta which is required for the understanding of the Vacyartha.

*Kaciccarutvanispattih*, means the Carutvanispatti of a superior kind i.e. Vacyatisayini Carutvanispattih.

*Paryayokte Pi yadi Pradhanyena...... Tatropasarjanibhavena-vivaksitatvat.* In Paryayokta also predominance cannot be put down to the Vyangyartha for the Carutvotkarsa in it is concerned with the turn of speech or periphrasis by which the fact to be intimated is presented. Bhamaha defines Paryayokta as:-

*Paryayoktam Yadanyena Prakarenabhidhiyate.*[116]
Udbhata accepts Bhamaha's definition with an elucidation of *Anyena Prakarena* as:-

*Vacyavacakavrttibhyam Sunyenavagamatmana*[117]

115. Kavyalankarasarasangraha
116. Kavyalankara.
117. Kavyalankarasarasangraha.

i.e. by Avagamanavyapara void of the functions of Vacya and Vacaka. The definition of the Paryayokta itself will show that in the figure of speech, it is Abhidhiyamanatva which is stressed. The Vyangyartha only helps the Abhidhiyamanartha. Thus in:-

*'Satrucchedadrdhecchasya Munerutpathagaminah*
*Ramasyanena Dhanusa Desita Dharmadesana*[118]

the suggested sense in the form of *Bhismasya Bhargavaprabhavabhi Bhavi Prabhavah* forms an accessory to the statement *Desita Dharmadesana.* The Abhidhiyamanartha contained in Desita Dharmadesana is embellished by the sense suggested. Cf. *Bhismasya Bhargavaprabhavabhibhavi Prabhava Iti Yadyapi Pratiyate, Tathapi Tatsahayena 'Desita Dharmadesana' Ityabhidhiyamanenaiva Kavyartho Lankrtah.*[119]

Should the expression Abhidhiyate in the Paryayoktalaksana of Bhamaha be interpreted as Pradhanyena Pratiyate and thus Vyangyapradhanya be argued in Paryayokta and certain instances of Dhvani like *Bhrama Dharmika*...etc.[120] be quoted as illustrating Paryayokta, it may be said that what will be proved is only the inclusion of Paryayokta in Dhvani and not that the purpose of Dhvani is served by Paryayokta.

There are several instances of Kavyas wherein there is Vyangyarthapratiti of a pre-eminent character though they do not possess the requisite characteristics of Paryayokta. When compared to Dhvani, the field of Paryayokta will be found to be very limited. Paryayokta may hold good in the Vivaksitanyaparavacya type of Dhvani. But in the Avivaksitavacya type where the expressed sense is not in the least intended to be conveyed, periphrasis has no place. The immensity of the scope of Dhvani will be understood by the several divisions and sub-divisions pointed out as occurring with regard to it. Further so long as Paryayokta is contended to be an Alankara, it forms only a factor producing Carutva to the bodily constituent of a Kavya. It cannot be

118. Locana
119. *Ibid*
120. Dhvanyaloka

argued to contain a thing which forms the Angin. Even if it be said that Paryayokta could be brought under Dhvani, it will be bereft of Alankaratva. Thus the Purvapaksin, instead of gaining his point, *Kamaniyakam Anativartamanasya Tasyoktesveva Carutvahetusvantarbhavah*, will find himself nowhere since the Alankaratva itself of the Paryayokta will be lost.

*Na Punah Paryayokte......Avivaksitatvat.* The instance of Paryayokta quoted by Bhamaha is:

*Grhesvadhvasu Va Nannam Bhunjmahe Yadadhitinah*
*Vipra Na Bhunjate Tacca Rasadananivrttaye.*

The verse forms the words of Srikrsna to Sisupala and means 'We do not eat either at home or abroad food which has not been eaten by Brahmans learned in Vedas.' The Vyangyartha is pointed out by Bhamaha himself to be the Rasadananivrtti, i.e. the prevention of poison being administered. Here Rasadananivrtti is conveyed in a manner different from the ordinary one. It is clear that in the verse it is the Vacyartha to the effect 'I shall not eat the food given by you' that forms the principal. The Vyangyartha is only a Nimitta accounting for Krsna's desisting from eating. As there is no subordination intended for the Vacyartha, the question of the Vyangyartha being prominent does not arise at all in examples like the one cited by Bhamaha.

*Apahnutidipakayoh......... Prasiddhameva.* In Apahnuti and Dipaka for the accomplishment of the Apahnava and the Dipana which are Vacya, the help of the Aupamya suggested is essential. The very names Apahnuti and Dipaka given to them in preference to Upama will themselves bear testimony to the fact that the Carutva in them centres round the Vacyartha and not the Vyangyartha.

*Sankaralankarepi...... Na Dhvanivisayatvam.* Sankara is the blending together of figures of speeches. Udbhata mentions four types of Sankara, namely Sandehalankara, Sabdarthavartyalankarasankara, Ekasabdabhidhanasankara and Anugrahyanugrahakabhavasankara.[121] Of these the second is a mixture of a

120. Kavyalankarasarasangraha

Sabdalankara and Arthalankara, and the third is a mingling of two Alankaras that occur in a word or group of words that form a part of a sentence. In the absence of an Alankara existing in a suggested manner in both the above types there is no room for Dhvanitvasambhavana in them. In the fourth type which is defined by Udbhata as:

*Parasparalankarena Yatralankrtayah sthitah*
*Svatantryenatmalabham No Labhante Sopi Sankarah*[122]

an expressed Alankara and a suggested Alankara may appear. But the relation between them being Anugrahyanugrahakabhava, they are not independent of each other, but exist by contributing to each other's development. Thus there being no intention of Pradhanya with reference to the Alankara suggested, it cannot be regarded as Dhvani. In the Sloka

*Pravatanilotpalanirvisesa-*
*Madhiravipreksitamayataksyah*
*Taya Grhitam Nu Mrganganabhya-*
*Stato Grhitam Nu Mrganganabhih*[123]

there is Sankara of Sandeha and Upama. Sandeha is expressed while the Upama drawing attention to similarity between Parvati-vilokana and Mrganganavilokana is suggested. The two Alankaras stand in such a way as contributing to one another's charm. The Sandeha itself has for its basis the Aupamya; and the Aupamya is made manifest by the Sandeha.

*Alankaradvayasambhavanayam Tu Vacyavyangyayoh Samam Pradhanyam.* In the first type of Sankara which is defined as

*Anekalankariyollekhe Samam Tadvrttyasambhave*
*Ekasya Ca Grahe Nyayadosabhave Ca Sankarah*[124]

two Alankaras are doubted for want of specific reasons to accept or reject the one or the other. In this type of Sankara also there is a possibility of one of the Alankaras doubted being Vyangya.

122. Kavyalankarasarasangraha.
123. Kumarasambhava
124. Kavyalankarasarasangraha

Here too, no Pradhanyavivaksa can be established for the Vyangyalankara inasmuch as Vacya and Vyangya have equal importance. To illustrate in the Sloka:–

*Sasivadanasitasarasijanayana Sitakumudadasanapanktiriyam*
*Gaganajalasthalasambhavahrdyakara Krta Vidhina*[125]

which forms the words of a lover describing the night, there is Rupakalankara expressed and the Upamalankara suggested. In deriving the words as *Sasi Eva Vadanam Yasyah Sa, Sitakumudani Eva Dasanapanktih Yasyah Sa* there is Rupaka. The superimposition of Vadanatva on Sasin, of Nayanatva on Asitasarasijas and of Dasanatva on Sitakumudas gives rise to Rupaka. What is suggested here is the Aupamya of Sasin and Nayikavadana, of Nilotpalas and Nayikanayanas and of Sitakumudas and Nayikadasanas. As there are no favourable or unfavourable arguments to accept or set aside anyone of them, there is no question of one being considered more important than the other. In examples like *Rajanarayanam Laksmistvamalingati Nirbharam*,[126] although both Rupaka and Upama exist, one as expressed and the other as suggested, the Rupaka which is expressed can be proved to be more important than the Upama suggested. Laksmi embraces only Narayana and not a person resembling Narayana. Hence the Abhedarupaka in the form of *Rajabhinnam Narayanam Tvam Laksmih Alingati* has more point in favour of being accepted than *Narayanasadrsan Rajanam Tvam Laksmih Alingati.* As an example of Vyangyalankara standing out in a more prominent way than Vacyalankara may be quoted:–

*Padambujam Bhavatu Me Vijayaya Manju-*
*Manjirasinjitamanoharamambikayah.*[127]

In Padambujam, it is the Aupamya which is suggested between Pada and Ambuja that stands to prominence when compared with the Rupana for the conception Manjirasinjitamanoharam is inapplicable to Ambuja. Since there is Badhakapramana for Rupaka, the implied Upama is the main Alankara.

125. Locana
126. Kavyalankara, III, 29.
127. Kavyalankarasarasangraha, V, 8.

Unlike in these two examples, in *Sasivadana*......etc. there is nothing to determine the Pradhanya or Apradhanya of the sense concerned for want of Badhakapramana or Sadhakapramana with regard to either of them.

The portion *Vyngyavacyataya Eva Aniscayat* contained in the lines *Yugapad Dvayasambhavad Ekatarapaksatyagagrahe Pramanabhavat Sankara Iti Vyangyavacyacyataya Eva Aniscayat Ka Dhvanisambhavana*[128] does not fit in with the text of the Aloka *Alankaradvayasambhavanayam Tu Vacyavyangyayoh Samam Pradhanyam* where an impossibility of determining which is Vacya and which is Vyangya does not seem to be intended.

*Atha Vacyopasarjanibhavena......... Paryayoktanirdistanyayat.* The Purvapaksin now argues that there are instances of Sankar-alankara where a suggested Alankara stands with the expressed Alankara subordinated to it as:–

> *Bhavati na Gunanuragah Khalanam Kevalam Prasiddhisarananam*
> *Kila Prasnauti Sasimaniscandre Na Priyamukhe Drste*[129]

and that Dhvani could be brought under this type of Sankara. In the example quoted, the expressed Arthantaranyasa which forms the Prakrta is only an accessory to the Alankaras Vyatireka and Apahnuti which are suggested in the most agreeable manner. The fact that the unintelligent who care to bow only to the cele-brated do not have any respect for praiseworthy qualities is sub-stantiated by citing the particular case of the moon-stone which emits fluid at the sight of the moon but not when it sees the face of the beloved. The Arthantaranyasa is Prastuta and it is expressed. There is in the verse Vyatireka or a contrasting of things compared in some respects with each other suggested. The Vyatireka is in the form of *Candrapeksaya Priyamukhasya Adhikagunatvam.* Apahnuti in the form of *Nayam Candrah, Priyamukhamevaju Sah* is also suggested.

The expressed Arthantaranyasa will be seen here to suggest Vyatireka and Apahnuti. At the same time it stands in a state

128. Alankarasutra (Trivandrum Sanskrit series) p. 122.
129. Didhiti.

of subordination to them. It is not so much the Samarthana of the general fact (*Kevalam Prasiddhisarananam Jadanam Gunanuragabhavah*) by the Visesa (*Sasimaneh Candradarsane Prasnavah, Priyamukhadarsane Prasnavabhavasca*) as the Vyatireka and the Apahnava that are really attractive.

The Siddhantin meets the Purvapaksin's standpoint by saying that on the same lines of argument resorted to in the case of Paryayokta, instances like the one pointed out will come under Dhvani and not the other way. It may be noted the Siddhantin's view point is that examples like this may perhaps be regarded as Alankaradhvani which forms a division of the Kavyaprakara called Dhvani. If Sankäralankara of the type illustrated is accepted to come under Dhvani, it will lose Alankaratva itself. This will be detrimental to the purpose of the Purvapaksin namely the establishment of the inclusion of Dhvani under Alankaras.

*Api Ca Sankaralankarepi.........Nirakaroti.* Sankara means the blending of two or more things. The S nkaratva lies in the Anyonyasammilitatva of the things blended together. Hence the term Sankara itself shows that there is no intention of Pradhanya with regard to one or the other of the combined elements.

In *Sankaralankare pi Ca Kvacit* of the Aloka, the Anvaya is *Kvacitapi Sankaralankare Ca.*

*Aprastutaprasamsayamapi.........Samameva Pradhanyam.* In Aprastutaprasamsa where the principal theme of description is presented in a suggested manner by a statement describing an object removed from the principal theme, it is possible to distinguish clearly the Vyangyartha from the Vacyartha. If it is contended here that the Vyangyartha has greater prominence than Vacyartha and th t on that score Dhvani could be brought under Aprastutaprasamsa, the Siddhantin says that the Purvapaksin's view is not acceptable.

Aprastutaprasamsa is defined by Bhamaha as:-

*Adhikaradapetasya Vastuno Nyasya Ya Stutih*
*Aprastutaprasamseti Sa Caivam Kathyate Yatha*[130]

130. Locana

Udbhata observes that the Stuti of the non-principal theme should be qualified by Prastutarthanubandhitva. Cf.

*Adhikaradapetasya Vastuno Nyasya Ya Stutih*
*Aprastutaprasamseyam Prastutarthanubandhini*[131]

The connection between the Aprastuta and the Prastuta is pointed out by the Vrttikara as arising through Samanyavisesabhava, Nimittanimittibhava and Sarupya. Ruyyaka also will be seen to have noticed the three relations. Cf. *Aprastutat Samanyavisesabhave Karyakaranabhave Sarupye Ca Prastutapratitavaprastutaprasamsa.*[132] In instances of Aprastutaprasamsa exhibiting the first two relations, the expressed and the suggested senses have only equal importance. There is no Visesa which does not possess Samanya and there is no Samanya independent of Visesas. Similarly Karya always presupposes Karana and Karana always produces Karya. Hence there is only Samapradhanya for Visesa and Samanya on the one hand and Karana and Karya on the other.

*Yada Tavat......Samanyasyapi Pradhanyam.* In Aprastutaprasamsa of the Samanyavisesabhava relation, the expresse Aprastuta may take the form of either Samanya or Visesa. When Samanya is expressed, the suggested will be Visesa and when Visesa is expressed, the suggested will be Visesa.

*Yada Tu Sarupyamatravasena ......... Dhvanavevantahpatah.* Aprastutaprasamsa of the Sarupyanibandhana type consists in the description of the non-principal theme suggesting the principal theme which bears resemblance to it. For example in

*Kastvam Bhoh Kathayami Daivahatakam Mam Viddhi Sakhotakam*
*Vairagyadiva Vaksi Sadhu Viditam Kasmadidam Kathyate*
*Vamenatra Vatastamadhvagajanah Sarvatmana Sevate*
*Nacchayapi Paropakarakarani Margasthitasyapi Me*

Nirdhanamanasvivrttanta is suggested by the expressed Sakhotakavrttanta. Since it is utterly impossible that a conversation takes place between a traveller and a Sakhotaka tree, the Vacyartha here

131. Didhiti
132. Kavyaprakasa.

may be argued to be destitute of any charm and that on that score not intended to be predominant. Should Vyangyapradhanya be tried to be established in this and in similar instances, it is true that there is no Samanyavisesabhava or Nimittanimittibhava favouring the attribution of a similar Pradhanya to Vacya also. Nevertheless the Siddhantin holds that there cannot be Carutvotkarsa with regard to Vyangya since Sarupya itself implies Samapradhanya to Vacya and Vyangya. If, however, the Purvapaksin contends that where predominance is not intended for Vacya, Vyangyapradhanya could be established, the Siddhantin will be for regarding such examples as coming under Dhvani only. If, on the other hand, there is Samapradhanya for Vacya and Vyangya, or greater prominance for Vacya, it goes without saying that the Kavya concerned is to be considered as a kind of Alankara in which case it will be an example of Gunibhutavyangya and not of Dhvani.

*Sarupyamatravasena.* Matrac is intended to exclude Aprastutaprasamsa based upon relations other than Sarupya as Samanyavisesabhava and Nimittanimittibhava.

*Itaratha Tu* means *Aprastutasya Sarupasyabhidhiyamanasya Pradhanyenavivaksabhave* i.e. when Vacya and Vyangya are of equal importance or when Vacya has greater prominance than Vyangya.

*Alankarantaratvam* means Alankaravisesatvam and not Anyalankaratvam.

It will not be out of place in this connection to draw attention to the fact that in Aprastutaprasamsa it is invariably the Abhidhiyamana that has greater Carutva than the Pratiyamana. Just as in Aksepa and Anuttanimittavisesokti, it is the description of the Aprastuta in such a manner as to throw out the Prastuta thai strikes the men of taste as attractive in Aprastutaprasamsat By virtue of the Carutvotkarsa associated with Vacyartha. pre-eminence has to be put down for the same.

A discussion of the Pradhanya or otherwise of Vyangya in Aprastutaprasamsa is justified by Didhitikara as drawing attention to the Alankaras intended to be pointed out by the word Adi

in *Samasoktyaksepa... Sankaralankaradau.* Cf. *Sankaralankaradau Ityadipadagrhitayam Aprastutaprasamsayam Sambhavitam Dhvanerantarbhavam Nirakaroti.*[133] But Locanakara is found to remark after the comment on Aprastutaprasamsa that by the word Adi are meant Alankaras like Vyajastuti. Cf. *Uddese Yadadigrahanam Krtam Samasoktityatra Dvandve Tena Vyajastutiprabhrtiralankaravargopi Sambhavyamanavyngyanuvesah Sambhavitah.*[134] Probably the introduction of Aprastutaprasamsa may be as an Anubandha to the discussion of the pre-eminence or otherwise of Vacya and Vyangya in Sankaralankara. It may be noted that Samapradhanya for Vacya and Vyangya was shown to exist in one of the types of Sankaralankara where two Alankaras having mutual Anugrahyanugrahakabhava are blended together. It is clear that the type of Aprastutaprasamsa showing Samapradhanya for Vacya and Vyangya through Samanyavisesabhava or Nimittanimittibhava are analogous to the Anugrahyanugrahakabhavasankara. Similarly Sarupyanibandhanaprastutaprasamsa will be seen to bear resemblance to Sandehasankara.

*Tadayamatra sanksepah.* In explaining the purpose of *Upasarjanikrtasvarthau* of the Karika defining Dhvani, the Vrttikara drew attention to the fact that there is no Vyangyapradhanya in Samasokti etc and that they could not be considered as including Dhvani. The verses which follow are given by the Vrttikara as a summary of the discussion made by him to disprove the contention that Dhvani could be brought under Samasokti etc. In the Nirnayasagar edition, the verses appear as the text of the Karika. Didhitikara also believes that the verses belong to the Karikagrantha. Cf. *Karikadvayamidam agrima ca karika vrttigrantha iti kecit.*[135] But when we consider that the verses in question occur in the middle of the Vrttigrantha elucidating Dhvanilaksanakarika it is only reasonable that they are ascribed to the Vrtti portion. It may also be noted that the comment on *Suribhih kathitah* occurs hereafter.

*Vyangyasya yatrapradhanyam...... mantavyah sankarojjhitah.* In the first verse *Vyangyasya......sphutah* it is stated that where

133. Rasagangadhara.
134. Locana.
135. Dhvanyaloka

Vyangya is merely a follower of Vacya and for that reason is comparatively unimportant, Samasoktyadis are no doubt to be regarded as Arthalankaras. By Samasoktyadis here all the Alankaras referred to in the line *Samasoktyaksepa..............Sankaralankaradau* have to be understood. Although there is in these a clear cognisance of the suggested sense, it exists only in a state of subordination since it goes to enhance the beauty of the expressed sense which latter stands but pre-eminently as being the Vakyartha. In the second verse, the nature of the compositions where Dhvanitva could not be conceived is pointed out. The suggested sense in a Kavya can show itself either in a clear form or in a non-clear form. Instances where the suggested sense is of a non-clear character offer no scope for Dhvani. Likewise no Dhvanitva could be attributed to Kavyas containing the suggested sense of a clearly cognisable nature if it dwindles itself to the position of Anga of the Vacyartha by its being possessed of Dharma in the form of Vacyarthanugamitva. There are certain poems in which it will be impossible for us to determine the superiority of the suggested sense over the expressed sense. This may be due either to a conception of equal importance to both Vacya and Vyangya or to the uncertainty with regard to the superiority of the one over the other. These also do not deserve to be grouped under Dhvani. The third verse goes on to explain the true scope of Dhvani. In a Dhvanikavya, Vacakasabdas and Vacyarthas should, in addition to possessing suggestiveness, be always in a state of exclusive devotion to the sense suggested. Thus it is clear that Dhvani occurs only when there is Vyangyapradhanya. The definitions of Dhvani attempted by scholars of a later period will be found to agree in full with the view expressed here. Cf.

*Idamuttamamatisayini vyangye vacyaddhvanirbudhaih kathitah*[136] of Mammata and

*Sabdarthau yatra gunibhavitatmanau kamapyarthamabhivyanktah tadadyam,*[137] of Jagannatha.

To illustrate the unsullied scope of Dhvani, we have to seek for places where Sabdas and Arthas should, in addition to possessing

136. Dhvanyaloka
137. Ibid

suggestiveness, be always in a state of exclusive devotion to the sense suggested and which (places) are not calculated to give room for doubts by Vyangyatva being blended with other factors such as Alankaras. Sankarojjhitah would mean, therefore, instances devoid of the co-existent of Vyangyatva and Alankara. When once the unmixed scope of Dhvani is pointed out, the Purvapaksin's contention that Dhvani could be brought under Alankaras stands repudiated.

Locanakara construes four types of instances wherein Dhvanivyavahara is not resorted to as being indicated in the first two verses. Cf. *Tena catursu prakare.u na dhvanivyavaharah sadbhave pi vyangyasya, apradhanye mlistapratitau, vacyena samapradhanye, asphutapradhanye ca.*[138] He would consider Vacyarthanuyayitva as occurring in Samasoktyadis to be different from Vacyarthanugama as manifesting in Aprastutaprasamsa. For the Pratibhamatratva of Vyangya he cites the Upamadis. A careful examination of the text of the Aloka will show that Anuyayitva and Anugamitva are used by the Vrttikara more or less in the same sense. Cf. *Samasoktau tavad upodha.........laksitam ityadau vyangyenanugatam vacyameva pradhanyena pratiyate*;[139] and *Apahnutidipakayoh punarvacyasya pradhanyam vyangyasyanuyayitvam prasiddha meva.*[140] Hence it does not seem desirable to bring in a new interpretation for Vacyarthanugama here. What have actually been pointed out in the three verses are: (i) the scope of the figures of speech like Samasokti; (ii) places where there is no room for Dhvanitvasanka; and (iii) the nature of the exclusive field of action of Dhvani respectively.

*Tasmat.* Because of the sphere of Dhvani being made clear to differ from that of Alankaras etc.

*Anyatra.* In Alankaras like Samasokti.

*Itasca nantarbhavah.* The non-inclusion of Dhvani in Vacyalankaras is established on another ground also. The argument is that there cannot be identicalness between them since Dhvani forms the Angin while Alankaras form Angas.

138. Kavyaprakasa.

139. Locana.

140. Dhvanyaloka

*Yatah Kavyaviseso ........ Kathitah.* Dhvani was indicated to be the Angin when it was observed to be a particular kind of Kavya in *Kavyavisesah sa Dhvaniriti Suribhih Kathitah.*

*Tasya Punarangani ...... Pratipadayisyante.* Alankaras, Gunas and Vrttis are pointed out later to be the Angas of Dhvani.

*Na Cavayava Eva .......... Tannisthatvameva.* The Purvapaksa that Dhvani is identical with Alankara is refuted by the Siddhantin from three standpoints. (i) When Alankara is shown to be only one of the Avayavas, it cannot, by itself, be regarded as Avayavin, i.e. Dhvani. (ii) When Alankara is viewed along with other factors going into the constitution of Dhvani, there will be no difficulty to realise its Angatva. (iii) Alankara may form the Avayavin itself in Kayvas which are Alankarapradhana. Nevertheless this cannot however be argued in favour of the identicalness of Alankaras and Dhvani for even in places where there is no trace of Alankaras, Dhvanitva could be found. Hence Alankaranisthatva, i.e.. *Alankare Nistha paryavasanam Yasya Tasya Bhavah* for Dhvani is impossible to be contended.

*Suribhih Kathitah Iti .... Dhvanirityuktah.* The Vaiyakaranas recognise what is known as Sphota, the eternal and imperceptible element of sounds and words as a real vehicle of the idea which flashes on the mind when a sound is uttered. In their opinion, Varnas uttered cannot be responsible for the sense being conveyed. Since Varnas severally or conjointly cannot be responsible for the Arthapratiti, they accept what is called Sphota from which the sense shines forth. The word Sphota is derived *Sphutatyasmadartha Iti Sphotah.* This Sphota is made manifest by the Varnas that finally strike our ears in the process of hearing. When a sound is uttered, it is believed that there are several sounds produced one after another in the course of its transmission to the hearers' ears. The last sound which is received is supposed to be the Vyanjaka of the Sphota. This Sabda which is suggestive of Sphota is called Dhvani by the Vaiyakaranas. The same name Dhvani was borrowed by Dhvanyacaryas to denote a Kavya having the power to suggest a pre-eminent sense. Dhvani is the Vyanjaka of the all-important Sphota. Similarly Dhvanikavya is the Vyanjaka of the all-important sense.

The point intended to be stressed by *Suribhih Kathitah* of the Karika is shown by Alokakara to be that the principle expounded and the appellation Dhvani given to it are not without authority since they have gained the approval of scholars who have keenly observed the essential truths of poetry and that the theory formulated deserves therefore to be esteemed. Hence the criticism *Na Ca Tatsamayantahpatinah Sahrdayan Kamscit Parikalpya Tatprasiddhya Dhvanau Kavyavyapadesah Pravartitopi Sakala-vidvan-Manograhitamavalambate,* [141] cannot have any value.

Note that the compound Vidvadupajna is to be taken as Bahuvrihi and not as Tatpurusa, the Vigraha being Vidvadbhyah Upajna Yasyah Sa.

*Vacyavacakasammisrah.* The Kavya is principally Sabdarupa. It is this general nature of Kavya that the word Sabdatma signifies. On a closer analysis of the outer form of a Kavya, it is possible to discern that it is constituted of Sabdas and Arthas. Vacyartha and Vacakasabda being Vyanjakas, the Kavya which is Sabdartha-sammisra and Sabdatman is also a Vyanjaka. Thus there is Vyanjakatva common to Dhvanikavya and Sabdaja-sabdarupa-dhvani and Vyangyatva common to Pradhanibhutartha and Pradhanibhutasphota. Cf. *Budhairvaiyakaranaih Pradhanabhuta-Sphotarupavyangyavyanjakasya Sabdasya Dhvaniriti Vyavaharah krtah. Tatastanmatanusaribhiranyairapi Nyagbhavitavacyavyangya-Vyanjanaksamasya Sabdarthayugalasya.*[142]

Locanakara quoting the authority of Vakyapadiya points out that the term Dhvani is employed by the Vaiyakaranas to denote Sphota which is suggested, Sabdajasabda which is suggestive of Sphota and the Vyapara in the form of Druta, Vilambita etc. resorted to over and above usual effort called forth in pronouncing sounds or words. Corresponding to the import with which the word is employed by the Vaiyakaranas, the Dhvanyacaryas also make use of the word to signify Vyangya, Vyanjaka and Vyanjanavyapara. Of these, Vyanjaka may be either a word or sense. Thus these four individually have been styled Dhvani. Dhvanitva-vyavahara with regard to a Kavya is also made in view of

141. Dhvanyaloka
142. Dhvanyaloka

the fact that the Kavya is a Samudayarupa of the four Dhvanis mentioned.

This view of the upholders of Dhvani is, according to Locanakara, set forth by the Alokakara in Vacyavacakasammisrah...... Dhvanirityuktah. Cf. *Vacyavacakasahitah Sammisra Iti Madhyamapadalopi Samasah. Gamasvam Purusam Pasum Itivat Samuccayo Tra Cakarena vinapi Tena Vacyopi Dhvanih. Vacakopi Sabdo Dhvanih. Dvayorapi Vyanjakatvam Dhvanitvabhavat. Sammisrite Vibhavanubhavasamvalanacchayayeti Vyangyopi Dhvanih Dhvanyata Iti Krtva. Sabdanam Sabdah Sabdavyaparah. Na Ca Asavabhidharupah. Api Tvatmabhutah. Sopi Dhvananaddhvanih. Kavyamiti Vyapadesyasca Yo Rthah Sopi Dhvanih. Uktaprakara Dhvanicatustayatvat.*[143]

*Na Caivamvidhasya.........Aviskaraniyam.* The nature and scope of Dhvani were shown to be quite different from those of Alankaras. Further, it was made clear that Dhvani forms the Angin while the Alankaras form only Angas. Dhvani is of a greatly extensive scope since its Laksya forms the totality of the output of all great poets. It is going to be shown later that Dhvani is mainly of two kinds, Avivaksitavacya and Vivaksitanyaparavacya. Both these Prabhedas have their own subdivisions. The first falls into two groups namely Arthantarasankramitavacya and Atyantatiraskrtavacya. The second also exhibits two divisoins namely Asamlaksyakramavyangya and Samlaksyakramavyangya. These sub divisions again have further different varieties. Rasadidhvani which falls under Asamlaksya-kramavyangya type itself occurs in countless ways. Cf.

*Tasyanganam Prabheda Ye Prabhedah Svagatasca Ye*
*Tesamanantyamanyonyasambandhaparikalpane.*[144]

Thus the scope of Dhvani will be known to be greatly extensive. Dhvani, by reason of its Mahavisayatva, cannot, in its entirety, be said to contain in Alankara which is Alpavisaya. Hence the

143. Locana
144. Locana

criticism *Kinca Vagvikalpanam...... Prakasayitum sakyam*[145] can, in no way, stand.

*Tadevam.........Pratyuktah.* The views of the three sets of Abhavavadins are disproved by the foregone discussion.

*Asti Dhvanih.* With the repudiation of the views of the Abhavavadins, the existence of Dhvani is established.

*Sa Casau.........Dvividhah Samanyena.* After explaining the definition of Dhvani, the two broad divisions of Dhvani with their examples are drawn attention to in the Vrtti. The names of the two divisions themselves are calculated to show the subordinance of Vacya in them. In Avivaksitavacya, there is either a transferance of the Vacya into another sense or a total discardance of it brought about by its unserviceableness and in-applicability respectively. As Vacyartha is not intended to be pre-eminent, its subordinance to the Vyangyartha is obvious. In Vivaksitanyaparavacya, the Vacyartha is no doubt meant to be said; but at the same time it is exclusively devoted to the Vyangyartha. It is this Anyaparatva of Vacya that is responsible for its subordinance in this division of Dhvani. Thus in both these types of Dhvani, the expressed sense and expressive word which form Vyanjakas of the Pratiyamanartha will be found to characterise Upasarjanikrtasvarthatva.

*Suvarnapuspam......Sevtum.* Here the Vakyartha in the form of 'heaping up gold-flowering earth by is Suradis' is inapplicable for there is no land which causes to flower gold. Hence *Suradikartrkam Suvarnapuspaprthvicayanum* has to be taken as pointing. through Laksana to the fact that Suradis effortlessly acquire abundant wealth in whatever land they be. Thus Laksana forms the basis here of the Vyanyartha. It will be seen that in the Kavya above, Sabda is the main Vyanjaka while Artha is its Sahakarin. In presenting the Vyangyartha, Locanakara observes that there are four Vyaparas namely Abhidha, Tatparyasakti, Laksana and Vyanjana to be found manifesting. To begin with, Abhidha conveys the conventional sense of Suvarnapuspam to the effect

145. Locana

*Suvarnani Puspyati Iti Tam.* The connexion of Suvarnapuspam with Prthivim namely Visesanavisesyabhava is indicated next by Tatparyasakti after which there arises stultification of the primary sense of the word Suvarnapuspam. At this juncture, Laksana operates as a result of which the Laksyartha in the form of Sulabhasamrddhisambharabhajanata for the word is obtained. From the Laksanikaprayoga *Suvarnapuspam Prthivim* a sene in the form of the excellence of Suradis is cognised. There would be no cognisance of this sense if the Mukhyasabdaprayoga *Sulabhasamrddhisambharanukulam Prthivim* were resorted to. Thus it will be clear that there is a Prayojana underlying the Laksanikaprayoga here. The new sense seeks the help of another Vyapara namely Vyanjana for its manifestation.

The figure of speech in the verse is Dipaka since the Prastuta as contained in *Yasca Janati Sevitum* and the Aprastutas Sura and Krtavidya have connexion with the same Dharma in the form of Suvarnapuspaprthivi-cayana.

When the Vigraha of the word Suvarnapuspam is construed as Suvarnani Puspyati Iti Tam, the root Pusp has to be taken as being Antarbhavitanyartha because it is Akarmaka. The Krtpratyaya An being Nit, the word should take the feminine suffix Nip as per rule Tiddhanan.........etc. and have the form Suvarnapuspim. Hence Suvarnapuspam appears to be an archaic usage. Note that the verse occurs in Mahabharata. The emendation *Suvarnapuspam Prthivim* adopted by Didhitikara has no authority behind it.

*Dvitiyasyapi.* An example is next cited for the Vivaksitanyaparavacyadhvani, the second of the two broad divisions.

*Sikharani......'Sukasabakah.* The verse forms the words of a lover to his beloved. The Vakyartha is the eulogy of a young parrot in having acquired such great merits through indescribable penance in his previous lives as to enable him to bite the Bimba fruit resembling the Nayika's lower lip in point of colour. What is suggested is the fact that a person will not get an opportunity in life to enjoy the pleasure of kissing her on her lower lip without acquiring unusual meritoriousness. Thus, the Vyangya takes the form of Nayikadharasaubhagyatisayastuti. The glorification of

the young parrot which is the Vacyartha becomes wholly devoted to the suggested sense. The Vacyartha is here meant to be said unlike in *Suvarnapuspam......*etc. quoted in illustration of *Avivaksitavacya.* Nevertheless the Vacyartha being Anyapara, will be observed to be in a state of subordinance.

From the two verses illustrating Avivaksitavacya and Vivaksitanyaparavacya divisions of Dhvani, it will be clear that in a Dhvanikavya, Sabda and Artha suggest a new sense subordinating their own utilities. Thus it is established that Dhvani exists only when there is Vyangyapradhanya.

*Yadapyuktam......Pratisamadhiyate.* What is next attempted in the Karikagrantha is observed by Vrttikara to be a refutation of the view held by some that there is no difference between what is alleged to be a Dhvani and Bhakti i.e. a poetical composition containing figurative usage. When it is established that the soul of poetry is Pratiyamanartha and that the Kavya going to suggest that sense pre-eminently is Dhvani, it becomes necessary to controvert the view advanced by some to the effect that Dhvani is identical with a Kavya yielding a dependent sense.

*Bhaktya Bibharti......Dhvanih.* As has been said Bhakti and Dhvani here refer to poetical compositions. Their idintiecalness is disproved on the ground that their forms are different. In the first place, Dhvani is Pradhanibhutavyangyasvarupa while Bhakti is Upacaramatrasvarupa. Their difference is made clear by the difference observable with regard to the factors on which they are based. Although Vacya and Vacaka got to convey a different sense in both cases, in Dhvani there is their exclusive devotion to the sense presented which latter, therefore, is characterised by pre-eminence. But in Bhakti the new sense resulting as it does through the operation of Gunavrtti i.e. a non-principal Abhidhavyapara, cannot be said to be of a greater importance than the Vacya and Vacaka. Gunavrtti, through the application of which the Bhaktartha arises, is always in the form of a non-principal Vyapara of the Sabda. Against this, Vyanjakatva i.e. the suggestive power through the application of which the Vyangyartha is obtained, in places where Sabdas are Vyanjakas, stands as a principal Vyapara of the Sabda. In places where Arthas are Vyanjakas, the Vyapara can never give occasion to be doubted

as non-principal because the Artha bears direct Vyanjakatva with reference to the new sense. Further, the sense got through Gunavrtti is one which bears close connexion with the Mukhyartha, while that obtained through suggestiveness is far remote from the Vacyartha. Again where the Mukhyartha indicates a new sense through Gunavrtti, the Mukhyartha will be found invariably to transform itself into the Amukhyartha. For example, in *Gangayam Ghosah*, the Pravaharupartha of the Gangapada assumes Tatarupartha with the working of Gunavrtti. On the other hand in Dhvani where one sense suggests another sense as in *Lilakamalapatrani Ganayamasa Parvati* the Vacyartha has a separate existence, although it is Vyangyapara. The relation between Vyangya and Vacya is Prakasyaprakasakabhava as in the instance of Ghata and Pradipa. Cf. *Yathaiva Hi Pradipadvarena Ghatapratitavutpannayam Na Pradipaprakaso Nivartate, Tadvad Vyangyapratitau Vacyavabhasah.*[146] Thus a great difference is perceivable between the sense got through the operation of Vyanjakatva and that got through the operation of Gunavrtti.

In the light of the difference established between the Pradhanibhutavyangyartha forming the soul of Dhvani and the Bhaktartha presented in Bhaktikavyas, the difference in form of Dhvani and Bhakti will be evident. Hence it is said that Dhvani does not bear oneness with Bhakti because of their difference in form. The difference between the forms of Dhvani and Bhakti is one fundamentally based on the difference of their respective Vyaparas namely Vyanjakatva and Gunavrtti. The fact that Vyanjakatva stands distinct from Gunavrtti is established after an elaborate discussion by the Vrttikara in the third Udyota in the portion beginning with *Gunavrttistupacarena......* and running up to *Tadetatsarvam Prak Sucitamapi Sphutatarapratitaye Punaruktam.*

*Ayam Uktaprakaro Dhvanih.* The word Uktaprakarah given as the meaning of Ayam shows that what is referred to by Dhvani in the Karika is Dhvanikavya whose definition was set forth in the preceding Karika *Yatrarthah Sabdo Va* etc.

*Vacyavacakavyatiriktasya......Sa Dhvanih.* In order to make clear the Bhinnarupatva of Dhvani and Bhakti, the nature of Dhvani

146. Dhvanyaloka.

as put down by the Karikakara is drawn attention to in these lines. The two points emphasized here with regard to Dhvani are the direct connection of Vacya and Vacaka with the new sense presented and the pre-eminence of that sense. It was already shown that when Sabda is Vyanjaka, the Vyapara through the help of which it suggests, is Mukhya. In the case of Artha forming Vyanjaka also the Mukhyatva of the Vyapara was pointed out in that there is no Vyapara other than Vyanjana coming in between the Vacyartha and the Vyangyartha.

*Upacaramatram Tu Bhaktih.* Bhakti is only figurative usage. It occurs in two ways being based upon either Prasiddhi i.e. general currency of words in senses other than their own or Anurodha i.e. close connection of the secondary sense with the primary sense of the word. Of these, in the one based on Prasiddhi, there will not be any special purpose intended in resorting to the figurative expression. Uses of expressions containing words like Lavanya, Sabrahmacarin, etc. are examples for this. In the second case i.e. in the one based on Anurodha exemplified by *Gangayam Ghosah; Agnirmanavakah* etc. there is a purpose in the form of pointing to Saityapavanatvadyatisaya and Aujjvalyadyatisaya etc. The Gunavrtti which is a Vyapara capable of conveying the two kinds of senses as pointed out forms the basis of Upacara i.e. figurative usage. Bhakti is based upon Gunavrtti while Dhvani is based upon Vyanjakatva. As Gunavrtti and Vyanjakatva are widely different, the senses resulting from them and poetical compositions characterised by such senses will also be mutually different in form.

It may be noted that Locanakara in explaining the word Uktaprakarah given in the Vrtti as the meaning of Ayam qualifying Dhvani observes that the reference is to the portion *Vacyavacakasammisrah Sabdatma Kavyamiti Vyapadesyo Vyanjakatva-Samyaddhvanirityuktah* wherein he construes that five meanings of Dhvani are intended to be pointed out by the Vrttikara. Cf. *Atroktaprakara Iti Pancasvarthesu Yojyam. Sabde Rthe Vyapare Vyangye Samudaye Ca.*[147] If Dhvani is to be construed in five different ways, Bhakti also requires to be interpreted as Sabda,

147. Didhiti

Artha, Vyapara, Bhaktartha, and Samudaya. Thus identicalness will have to be said as not arising between the five of Dhvani and the corresponding five of Bhakti. The Karikakara's and the Vrttikara's point, however, seems to be to repudiate the oneness of Dhvanikavya and Bhaktikavya. This is evidenced by *Ayam Dhvanih* immediately following the Karika wherein Dhvani has been pointed out to be a Kavyavisesa and the lines *Vacyavyatiriktasyarthasya Vacyavacakabhyam Tatparyenarthaprakasana Yatra Vyangyapradhanye Sa Dhvanih; Upacaramatram tu Bhaktih* in the Aloka drawing attention to Dhvanisvarupa and Bhaktisvarupa.

*Tatraitat Syadbhaktirlaksanam Dhvanerityaha.* The point raised next is whether Bhakti can be argued to be the Laksana of Dhvani as Prthivitva that of Prthivi. Pdthivitva distinguishes Prthivi from Jaladis. If Bhakti is likewise the Laksana of Dhvani, Bhakti should be found wherever there is Dhvani and at the same time Bhakti should not be found in places where Dhvani does not exist.

The word Bhakti here obviously means a Dharma and not Dharmin. Where identicalness is supposed for Bhakti and Dhvani as in the case of synonyms[148] both have to be Dharmins in so far as such a question does not arise between a Dharma and Dharmin. On the other hand, when Bhakti is mentioned to be a Laksana it has to mean necessarily a Dharma in the form of Laksakatva.

*Ativyapterathavyapterna......Taya.* Asau and Taya refer to Dhvani and Bhakti respectively and Ca shows the connection between the two halves of the Karika to the effect that in addition to non-identicalness of form, Bhakti cannot be regarded as the definition of Dhvani even. Bhakti cannot be the definition of Dhvani for reasons of its over-comprehensiveness and non-comprehensiveness which go to make the definition faulty. Bhakti could be found even in places where no Dhvanitva exists. Likewise all instances of Dhvani could not be found to possess Bhakti.

148. Dhvanyaloka

*Tatrativyaptih......Sambhavat.* The nature of Ativyapti is related when Bhakti is said to be the definition of Dhvani is explained here.

*Yatra hi......Mahat Sausthavam Nasti.* In instances of Dhvani there will be superior charm brought about by Vyanjakatva i.e. the suggestiveness of words and senses. It will be explained later that Sabda when Vyanjaka will be of such a nature as causing a charm which is impossible to be presented by another expression. Cf. the Karika *Uktyantarenasakyam .... Bhavet*[149] Artha when Vyanjaka presents another sense which is remotely different from it and stands apart from the new sense maintaining its identity. In Bhaktikavya words like Lavanya, Sabrahmacarin, etc., could be replaced by other words meaning Dyutivisesa, Sadrsa, etc. Likewise in instances of Bhaktikavya brought about by Gunavrtti based on Anurodha where some sort of Prayojana could be assumed as in *Gangayam Ghosah* etc., there is a transformation of the Pravaharupavacyartha into Tatarupartha which is closely connected with the former. The Mukhyartha, namely, Pravaharupartha has no separate existence here after its transformation into the new sense. Thus the great charm arising from Vyanjakatva which is charateristic of Dhvani will be found to be lacking in Bhaktikavya.

*Upacarttasabdavrttya.* The Vrtti referred to here is the force of words to denote their attendant significance. Usage of words in their attendant significance may proceed from their general currency or from their conformity. General currency consists in words being used in senses other than those of their own. By conformity is meant the conformity of a new usage with the original usage of words in their etymological significance.

*Prasiddhyanurodhapravartitavyavaharah.* Prasiddhi i. e. genera currency and Anurodha i.e. conformity are different. Didhitikara construes *Prasiddhyanurodhapravartitavyavaharah* as *Prasiddheh Rudheh, Anurodhena, Pravartito Vyavahara Sabdaprayogarupavyaparo Yaistadrsah.*[150] This goes against the lines *Prasiddhyanurodhabhyamapi Gaunanam Sabdanam Prayogadarsanat*[151] of

149. Locana
150. Locana
151. Locana

Aloka wherein Prasiddhi and Anurodha are found to have been mentioned separately. Locanakara's comment on Prasiddhyanurodhabhyam as *Prasiddhit Lavanyadayah Sabdah Vrttanurodha-Vyavaharanurodhadeh 'Vadati Bisinipatasayanam' Ityevamadayah*[152] is also in favour of taking them as two different circumstances underlying usages of the sort.

*Parimlanam ........ Bisinipattrasayanam.* In this verse, there is Upacara in that Vadati is used in its attendant sense, Sphutikaroti. There is inapplicability of the Mukhyartha of the root Vad—which literally means Vyaktavaguccarana since the Kartrpada Bisinipatrasayanam is inanimate. The usage of Vadati here is in conformity with the original sense of the root.

*Cumbyate...........Punaruktam.* The expression Punaruktam is used in the sense of a Dosa in the form of '*Paunahpunyena Upadanam*'. Uktam being applicable only in Sabda, fails to give any cogent sense here if construed literally.

*Kupitah Prasanna......... Mahilah.* Here the words Grhitah and Haranti are not used in their primary senses connected with the literal meanings of the roots Grah–'to seize' and Hr– 'to take away', the dependant senses being 'observed' and 'captivate'.

*Aryayah.........Sapatninam.* Here the word Dattah etymologically means Danavisayah Krtah. The literal sense of Dana to the effect of offering a Dravya in one's possession to another is inapplicable because Prahara does not admit of being offered as a gift. Hence Dana implied in the word Dattah is to be taken in the sense of *Danasaddhyam Phalavattvam.* The meaning when the Laksyartha is construed, will be *Kanistha-Bharyayah Stanaprsthe Tasyah Caritarthyasampadakah Praharo vihitah.*

*Pararthe yah ........... marubhuvah.* In this verse, Anubhavati being a Cetanasadhyakriya, does not fit in with Iksu which is an inanimate object. Hence Pidayah anubhavanam in *Pidamanubhavati* is to be taken in the sense of Pidavattvam. This Pidavattvam will be calculated to convey the Pidyamanata i.e. the state of being squeezed. With regard to the Mahapurusavrttanta which is

152. Locana

Prastuta, the word Anubhavati admits of being applied in its primary significance itself.

The above five verses are instances of Bhakti arising through the operation of Gunavrtti of the Anurodha type. The words Vadati, Punaruktam, etc. will be found to have been used not in their original meanings, but in their related significances.

*Uktyantarenasakyam ............ Bhavet.* The Karika draws attention to the nature of Vyanjakasabda in a Dhvanikavya. The Sabda should be of such a nature as making manifest a charm which could not be got through the employment of any other word. Uktyantarena means by another expression i. e. by a synonym of the word or by a word which primarily signifies the related sense. Asakyam is to be explained as Prakasayitumasakyam.

*Atra codahrte............ sabdah.* An examination of the Sabdas Vadati etc. used in the verses cited above, illustrating Bhakti will show that they are lacking in Uktyantarasakya-carutvavyaktihetutva which has been laid down as the invariable characteristic of the suggestive words of a Dhvanikavya. It may be said that Vadati etc., are characterised by some sort of Carutva in that there could be found in them a concealment of the idea intended to be expressed. But it is not mere concealment that is the criterion of Dhvani. Along with the hidden mode of saying the Sabdas should have the power to suggest a sense quite different from the one got through the principal literal signification or the non-principal literal signification. For conveying the intended sense, it does not make any difference whether Vadati, the concealed form or Sphuti-karoti, the direct form, is used. Similarly Punaruktam, Grhitah, Haranti, Dattah, and Pidamanubhavati are in no way capable of yielding a better charm than Punarupattam, Svikrtah, Vasikurvanti, Vihitah and Pidyamano Bhavati respectively. Thus in these instances it will be clear that there is no Prayojana in resorting to Upacaritasabdaprayoga. In the example of Dhvani, Suvarnapuspam, etc., on the other hand, the Prayojana in the form of Suradiprasastyaprakasana no doubt is evident. The Prayojana will also be observed to be incapable of being conveyed by replacing the word Suvarnapuspam by some other word. The charm which the Sabda makes manifest rests with the Artha. It follows therefore, that the Sabda which gives rise to Dhvanitvavyapadesa of the Kavya should

be Carutvatisayavisistarthaprakasaka. The sense is Carutvatisaya-visista, in so far as it could not be presented by any word other than the one employed. For example in Suvarnapuspam Prthivim, the charm as conveyed by the expression Suvarnapuspam cannot be expressed by using some such word as Sulabhasamrddhisambhara-bhajanabhutam. By the qualification Vyanjakatam Bibhrat given to the Sabda, it is pointed out that the Sabda in a Dhvanikavya conveys the new sense by virtue of its Vyanjakatva which latter has no connection whatever with Vacakatva. In Vadati Bisinipat-rasayanam, there is no place for Vyanjakatva at all because the sence Sphutikaroti is obtained through the working of a non-principal literal significance. Even if some Prayojana is attributed to the Vyavaharas based on Upacaritasabdavrtti, as in the above example, there will not be found in them the supreme charm characteristic of Dhvani. For the Prayojanas that could be conceived in Vadati etc. see Balapriya:– (1) *Atra sayanasya.*

(2) *Atra Prayojanam Adhikabhalasalitvarupam* (3) *Atra Atma Sak-atkaranam atyantavaivasyam ca kramena laksanayoh prayojanam* (4) *Prayojanam ca praharasya sukhopabhogyatvam.* (5) *Prayojanam ca kastavasthatvam.*

From what has been observed, it will be seen that Bhakti of the Anurodha type manifests itself even in places where Dhvanitva is not recognised to exist. Thus there is Ativyaptirupalaksanadosa if Bhakti is contended to be the definition of Dhvani.

*Rudha ye ............ padam dhavneh.* With regard to the words which are employed in senses other than their own on the strength of widely accepted usage, there is total absence of any charm, since there is no Prayojana underlying the transference of meaning in them.

*Lavanyadyah.* For words similar to Lavanya, see Locana– *Adigrahanena anulomyam, pratikulyam, sabrahmacarityevamadayah Sabdah laksanika grhyante.* Lavanyam etymologically means salt-ness. But it has gained currency in the sense of loveliness. Words like Lavanya wherein Upacaritasabdavrtti has its play, do not fall within the field of action of Dhvani. Hence in the case of Rudha-sabdas also, the Ativyaptidosa of the Laksana is evident.

*Api ca.* That Gunavrtti cannot be put down as the Laksana of Dhvani is established by drawing attention to the difference with regard to the Visaya of Gunavrtti and Vyanjakatva. In order to make this point clear, a place where both Gunavrtti and Vyanjakatva have their play has to be taken into consideration. Such a case could be found in instances of Laksanamuladhvani.

*Mukhyam vrttim............skhaladgatih.* The prose-order of the Karika is:- *Yatphalamuddisya mukhyam vrttim parityajjya gunavrttya arthadarsanam tatra sabdah skhaladgatih naiva bhavati.*

In places where a poet resorts to Laksanikasabdaprayoga as Suvarnapuspam Prthivim, etc., it is obvious that there is some special purpose in the form of Suradiprasastya intended to be conveyed. The word Suvarnapuspam qualifying Prthivim will point out Sulabhasamrddhisambharabhajanata through the help of Gunavrtti i.e. non-principal Abhidhavyapara which readily offers itself on account of the Mukhyarthabadha. But it presenting Suradiprasastya, the word Suvarnapuspam has a direct power as there is no incompatibility for the primary sense. And for want of materials such as Mukhyarthabadha, Gunavrtti cannot be resorted to for bringing out the Prayojanarupartha. The Artha which is the Visaya of Gunavrtti is Sulabhasamrddhisambharabhajanata and not Suradiprasastya. Doubtless, the Sabda must have a Vyapara capable of presenting the Prayojanarupartha. It was already pointed out that this cannot be the Gunavrtti. Nor can it be Abhidha for want of convention connecting the word with the sense. Hence the Vyanjanavyapara has to be accepted in such places to explain the Prayojanarupharthalabha.

Arthadarsanam. Note that the word Darsanam here is Nyanta. Cf. *Darsanamiti nyanto Nirdesah.*[153]

*Skaladgatih.* Skalanti Gatih Yasya Sah. Cf. Locana *Skhalanti badhakavyaparena vidhurikriyamanah gatih avabodhanasaktih yasya sabdasya.*[154]

153. Locana
154. Dhvanyaloka

*Tatra hi carutvatisaya.........dustataiva syat.* In instances of Dhvanikavya where Laksanikasabdaprayoga is resorted to by the poet with a view to present a charming sense, the contention that the Sabda seeks the help of a non-primary Vyapara in indicating the Prayojana cannot hold good for the employment of an expression which cannot, by itself, directly point to the Prayojana is calculated to detract poetic excellence. Nor can it be argued that in usages of the kind, the Carutvatisayavisistartha is made known through Laksana in so far as the requisites for Laksana are absent. In the first place, there is no Anvayanupapatti. Secondly when the Carutvatisayavisistartha is considered to be the Laksyartha, there must necessarily be another Prayojana and this we do not find. If it be said that there is a second Prayojana, this latter would have also to be argued by the Purvapaksin to be got through Laksanavyapara for which a gain a different Prayojana will be required. Having recourse to Laksana, in this way, would lead to non-finality.

*Na caivam,* means *na ca sabdasyamukhyata kacit* (*Carutvatisayavisistarthaprakasanalaksane prayojane avagamayitavye*). The sense presented is Mukhya since it is got through a principal Vyapara, Laksana being out of the question and Abhidha having no occasion to work for want of convention, a third Vyapara which may be termed as Vyanjana, has to be accepted.

*Vacakatvasrayenaiva ...... Katham.* That Gunavrtti cannot be the Laksana of Dhvani is made clear by drawing attention to the fact that Dhvani is solely based upon Vyanjakatva while Gunavrtti has nothing to do with Vyanjakatva. The latter is a non-principal Vyapara attaching itself to Abhidha. Thus Gunavrtti which adheres itself as a tail to Abhidha can, in no way, stand on a par with Vyanjakatva which is an independent and principal Vyapara. Gunavrtti and Vyanjakatva being poles asunder, a Kavya which is based upon Gunavrtti cannot give rise to the poetic composition nomenclatured Dhvani.

*Avyaptirapyasya Laksanasya.* The non-comprehensiveness of the Laksana referred to in the Karika portion *Ativyapterathavyapterna Casau Laksyate Taya* is now discussed.

*Na hi Dhvaniprabhedo......Bhaktya Vyapyante.* Although we meet with Bhakti in instances of Avivaksitavacyadhvani like

Suvarnapuspam etc., it is certain that it has no place in Vivaksitanyaparavacyadhvani where the Vacyartha is not at all stultified as in Sikharini Kvanu Nama etc.

The Purvapaksin's contention is that Laskana which includes Gauni as well, is responsible for presenting senses other than the expressed in all kinds of poetic compositions. The verses cited by the Siddhantin to illustrate the two broad divisions of Dhvani, namely Avivaksitavacya and Vivaksitanyaparavacya could, according to the Purvapaksin, easily be argued to afford scope for Laksana. With regard to the example for Avivaksitavacya, the Siddhantin himself accepts Laksana in the expression Suvarnapuspam qualifying Prthivim. Also in *Sikharini Kvanunama*, representing the Vivaksitanyaparavacya type, the Purvapaksin perceives Laksana in as much as its requisites Mukhyarthabadha, Nimitta and Prayojana are present, for a question of the kind relating to the parrot's Bimbaphaladamsa is obviously non-contextual and as such indicative of a different sense through the Nimitta in the form of Sadrsya. For the five grounds of Laksana see:

*Abhidheyena Samyogat Samipyat Samavayatah*
*Vaiparityat Kriyayogat Laksana Pancadha Smrta.*

Leaving aside Samlaksyakramavyangya, the Siddhantin can establish his point by drawing attention to Asamlaksyakramavyangya where no Mukhyarthabadha even of the slightest kind exists. The Purvapaksin may argue that in Asamlaksyakramavyangya, the cognisance of the durable states of mind as Rati etc., arising from an understanding of the Vibhavadis, is analogous to the recollection of fire closely following the knowledge of smoke and as such there is no Sabdavyapara to be assumed. But it has to be borne in mind that Rasapratipatti does not consist in the mere knowledge of another's state of mind through inference and the like. In inferring one thing from another no pleasure is experienced by us. The realisation of Rasa which results through the cogitation of the Vibhavadis presented in poetry is a blissful experience of a supermundane nature and therefore it does not deserve to be compared with Smarana or Anumana. In the realisation of Rasa, the Sahrdaya experiences for himself instead of having any feeling of aloofness as in the recollection of Agni from Dhumapratipatti. The Siddhantin's standpoint in the matter will be found

to be made clear in the portion:– *Kintu Laukikena Karyakarana-numanadina Samskrtahrdayo Vibhavadikam Pratipadyamana Eva Na Tatasthyena Pratipadyate, Api tu Hrdayasamvadaparaparya-yayasahrdayatvaparavasikrtataya Purnibhavisyadrasasvadankuri-bhavena Anumanasmaranadisaranim Anaruhyaiva Tanmayibhavano-citacarvanapranataya.*[155] Rasa which is thus Alaukika has been shown to be impossible to be presented through inference or any other Pramana. It is undoubtedly the Sabda and Artha of poetical compositions that present the Rasadis. We are, therefore, led to accept a Vyapara capable of revealing to us Rasadis from Sabda and Artha indicating the Vibhavadis. As Abhidha and Laksana are inadequate for the purpose it becomes essential for us to conceive of a new Vyapara viz., Vyanjana. The Purvapaksin who is so eager to dispense with Vyanjana will find himself in an awkward position in instances of mere sounds irrespective of sense suggesting Rasa.

The Siddhantin would further say that even in *Sikharini Kvanu nama* etc., the lover's excessive desire for Nayikadharas-vada does not at all depend upon Laksana in so far as the words themselves are directly powerful through a consideration of the context and the intention of the speaker etc., to convey the new sense. The idea of the portion *Nahi Dhavniprabhedo Vivaksi-tanyaparavacyalaksanah* (*Bhaktya vyapyate*) of the Vrtti will be clear in the light of the above discussion. By *Anye ca Bahavah Prakara Bhaktya* (*Nahi*) *Vyapyante* what is obviously intended to be pointed out is that Bhakti does not explain types of Dhvani other than Vivaksitanyaparavacyalaksana i. e., Vivaksitanya-paravacyaprabhedas. For instances like Suvarnapuspam etc., the Vyangyartha is derived irrespective of the requisites for Laksana. Refer the concluding lines of the elaborate discussion made on the point by Locanakara to the effect:–

*Ata eva 'Sikharini' Ityadavapi Mukhyarthabadhadikramam Ana-peksyaiva Sahrdaya Vaktrabhiprayam Catuprityatmakam Sam-vedayante. Ata Eva Granthakarah Samanyena Vivaksitanya-paravacye Dhvanau Bhakteh Abhavam Abhyadhat. Asmabhistu Durdurutam Pratyayayitum Uktam Bhavatvatra Laksana, Alaksya-krametu Kupitopi Kim Karisyasiti. Yadi tu na Kupyate Suvarna-puspam Ityadavavivaksitavacyepi Mukhyarthabadhadilaksana-samagrim Anapeksyaiva Vyangyarthavisrantih Ityalam Bahuna.*[156]

*Tasmadbhaktiralaksanam.* Tasmat here refers to the reasons adduced above, namely Ativyapti and Avyapti. It may be noted that the Bhinnasrayatva of Gunavrtti and Dhvani also formed one of the arguments put forward against the acceptance of Bhakti being considered as the definition of Dhvani.

*Kasyacid......Syadupalaksanam.* The Siddhantin is not blind to the fact that Avivaksitavacyadhvani may be found mixed up with Bhakti. But this accidental co-existence of Dhvani and Bhakti, he says, should never be argued in favour of Bhakti being regarded as the Laksana of Dhvani. In such places Bhakti has the place of only an Upalaksana as in *Kakavad Devadattagrham* where Kakavattva is neither the Svarupa nor the Laksana of the house but is only a temporary distinction.

*Sa Punarbhaktih...... Sambhavyeta.* Bhakti being found as the Upalaksana of Dhvani, does not in any way go to controvert the Siddhantin's position. This view point of the Siddhantin is to be understood from the indifference he attaches to the Upalaksanatva.

*Yadi Ca Gunavrttyaiva......Vaiyarthyaprasangah.* The opposers of the Dhvani School hold the opinion that Gunavrtti is extensive enough to include the newly propounded Dhvani and that as such there is no useful purpose served by attempts to define and classify it. The Siddhantin would meet their argument by putting a simple question to them. He asks them why Bhamaha and others have embarked themselves on defining each of the Alankaras in detail when Abhidhanabhidheyabhava which pervades all figures of speech is fully made known to the world of scholars by other Sastras such as Vyakarana and Mimamsa. The Purvapaksin cannot say that all the detailed information furnished by Bhamahadis is of no use. Gunavrtti may perhaps be said to pervade certain instances of Dhvani. That does not preclude us from making a detailed investigation of the charm in poetry. When we find that Gunavrtti is not sufficient to explain all the different aspects of beauty in poetry, it is only reasonable that we fall back to some other principle. Hence the definition and classification of Dhvani stands on a par with the description of individual Alankaras.

*Laksane Nyaih......Paksasamsiddhireva Nah.* The arguments of the Purvapaksin that Bhakti is the Laksana of Dhvani and that this Bhakti has already been pointed out by ancient rhetoricians are twisted by the Siddhantin in his favour. Should the Purvapaksin say that Bhakti is the Laksana of Dhvani, it would amount to his having accepted the thing i.e. Dhvani for the establishment of which the Siddhantin had been labouring hard. Paksasam siddhih here means the attainment of the view of the Siddhantin, the Siddhantin's view of course being 'There exists a Kavyaprakara known as Dhvani.'

*Yepi Sahrdaya......Tatprasaktam.* This portion is directed against those who hold the opinion that Dhvani beggars description referred to in the initial Karika. Cf. *Kecidvacam Sthitamavisaye Tattvamucustadiyam.*[157] The general nature of Dhvani has been made clear in Karikas like *Yatrarthah Sabdo Va* etc., while its particularities form the subject matter of the second and the third Uddyotas. When Dhvani is thus well-defined, no one can say that it is beyond the possibility of words to describe it.

*Yadi Punardhvaneh ...... Yuktabhidhayina Eva.* The Alaksaniyatvavada briefly set forth in the line *Kecidvacam Sthitamavisaye Tattvamucustadiyam* of the first Karika is further observed by the Vrttikara to be justifiable if interpreted to mean that the excellence of Dhvani amidst Kavyas is such that words are too feeble to acquaint us with its superior glory. Dhvani would then be something indefinable like Brahman described as *Yato Vaco Nivartante Aprapya Manasa Saha* etc. Such a twisting of the Purvapaksa introduced at the outset with all seriousness is obviously contradictory to the spirit of the Karika; and this leads us to think that the Vrttikara as a skilful commentator has tried to gain his point in a half humorous way by reading a sense not intended by the author of the Karika. If the Karikakara himself had written the Vrtti such an indifferent and nonserious bent of mind would not have been displayed.

*Kavyantaratisayi.* The other types of Kavyas referred to here are Gunibhutavyangya and Citra. The kind of Kavya known as Dhvani by reason of its excelling the other two types is the first in order as is evidenced by the name Uttamakavya given to it.

It may be noted that the Karikakara left the Alaksaniyatvavada out of serious consideration since the question did not arise with the refutation of the other two views viz. Abhavavada and Bhaktatvavada and the setting forth of the definition and the scope of Dhvani. However the Vrttikara as a commentator took it up to give completeness to his work.

What the first Uddyota achieves is Dhvanisthapana after a sound refutation of the Abhâvavada, Bhaktatvavada and the Alaksaniyatvavada. The nature of Dhvani and the desirability of making a detailed study of this particular kind of Kavya are also herein made clear to us by the author.

# ध्वन्यालोकः

## प्रथमोद्द्योतः

स्वेच्छाकेसरिणः स्वच्छस्वच्छायायासितेन्दवः[1] ।
त्रायन्तां वो मधुरिपोः प्रपन्नार्तिच्छिदो नखाः[2] ।।

**काव्यस्यात्मा ध्वनिरिति बुधैर्यः समाम्नातपूर्व–**
**स्तस्याभावं जगदुरपरे भाक्तमाहुस्तमन्ये ।**
**केचिद्वाचां स्थितमविषये[3] तत्त्वमूचुस्तदीयं**
**तेन[4] ब्रूमः सहृदयमनःप्रीतये तत्स्वरूपम् ।। १ ।।**

बुधैः काव्यतत्त्वविद्भिः काव्यस्यात्मा ध्वनिरिति संज्ञितः, परम्परया यः समाम्नातपूर्वः[5] सम्यक् आसमन्ताद् म्नातः प्रकटितः, तस्य सहृदयजनमनःप्रकाशमानस्याप्यभावमन्ये जगदुः । तदभाववादिनां चामी विकल्पाः सम्भवन्ति । तत्र[6] केचिदाचक्षीरन्—'शब्दार्थशरीरं तावत्काव्यम् । तस्य[7] च शब्दगताश्चारुत्वहेतवोऽनुप्रासादयः प्रसिद्धा एव । अर्थगताश्चोपमादयः । वर्णसङ्घटनाधर्माश्च[8] ये माधुर्या–दयस्तेऽपि प्रतीयन्ते । तदनतिरिक्तवृत्तयो वृत्तयोऽपि याः कैश्चिदुप–नागरिकाद्याः[9] प्रकाशिताः, ता अपि गताः श्रवणगोचरम् । रीतयश्च वैदर्भीप्रभृतयः । तद्व्यतिरिक्तः कोऽयं ध्वनिर्नामेति' ।

अन्ये ब्रूयुः । 'नास्त्येव ध्वनिः । प्रसिद्धप्रस्थानव्यतिरेकिणः काव्यप्रकारस्य काव्यत्वहानेः । सहृदयहृदयाह्लादिशब्दार्थमयत्वमेव काव्यलक्षणम् । न चोक्तप्रस्थानातिरेकिणो[10] मार्गस्य तत्सम्भवति ।

---

1. 'विजितेन्दवः' ग. 2. 'वः प्रपन्नार्तिच्छितो मधुरिपोर्नखाः' ग. 3. 'मविषयं' ग. 4. 'येन' ग. 5. समाम्नातः समाख्यातः तस्य–घ. 6. 'तत्र' क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति 7. तत्र–BP. 8. वर्ण omitted in MB. 9. 'काचि' ग. 10. 'तिक्रमिणो' ग.

न च तत्समयान्तःपातिनः सहृदयान् कांश्चित्परिकल्प्य तत्प्रसिद्धया[1] ध्वनौ काव्यत्वव्यपदेशः[2] प्रवर्तितोऽपि सकलविद्वन्मनोग्राहिता-मवलम्बते[3] ।'

पुनरपरे तस्याभावमन्यथा कथयेयुः । 'न सम्भवत्येव ध्वनि-नामापूर्वः कश्चित्[4] । कामनीयकमनतिवर्तमानस्य तस्योक्तेष्वेव चारुत्व-हेतुष्वन्तर्भावात्[5] । तेषामन्यतमस्यैव वा अपूर्वसमाख्यामात्रकरणे यत्किञ्चन कथनं[6] स्यात् ।

किञ्च वाग्विकल्पानामानन्त्यात्सम्भवत्यपि वा कस्मिंश्चित्काव्य-लक्षणविधायिभिः प्रसिद्धैरप्रदर्शिते[7] प्रकारलेशे ध्वनिर्ध्वनिरिति यदेत-दलीकसहृदयत्वभावनामुकुलितलोचनैर्नृत्यते तत्र हेतुं न विद्मः । सहस्रशो हि[8] महात्मभिरन्यैरलङ्कारप्रकाराः[9] प्रकाशिताः प्रकाश्यन्ते च । न च तेषामेषा दशा श्रूयते । तस्मात्प्रवादमात्रं ध्वनिः । न त्वस्य क्षोदक्षमं तत्त्वं[10] किञ्चिदपि[11] प्रकाशयितुं शक्यम् । तथा चान्येन कृत एवात्र श्लोकः ।

यस्मिन्नस्ति न वस्तु किञ्चन मनःप्रह्लादि सालङ्कृति[12]
व्युत्पन्नै रचितं च नैव[13] वचनैर्वक्रोक्तिशून्यं च यत् ।
काव्यं तद्ध्वनिना समन्वितमिति प्रीत्या प्रशंसञ्जडो
नो विद्मोऽभिदधाति[14] किं सुमतिना पृष्टः स्वरूपं ध्वनेः ।।

भाक्तमाहुस्तमन्ये । अन्ये तं ध्वनिसंज्ञितं काव्यात्मानं गुणवृत्ति-रित्याहुः[15] । यद्यपि च ध्वनिशब्दसंकीर्तनेन काव्यलक्षणविधायिभिर्गुण-वृत्तिरन्यो वा न कश्चित्प्रकारः प्रकाशितः, तथापि अमुख्यवृत्त्या[16] काव्येषु व्यवहारं दर्शयता ध्वनिमार्गो मनाक्स्पृष्टोऽपि न लक्षित इति[17] परिकल्प्यैवमुक्तम्—'भाक्तमाहुस्तमन्ये' इति ।

---

1. 'परिकल्पिततत्प्र'-घ 2. = व्यवहारः-MB. 3. 'मेव लम्वते'-ग. 4. कश्चित्प्रकारः-MB. 5. काव्यशोभाहेतु=-MB. 6. 'कथं न'-ख; कथितं'-ग. 7. प्रसिद्धैरदर्शिते-घ. 8. 'ऽपि'-क-ख. 9. = रन्यैरलंकारकारैरलं-MB. 10. 'क्षोदक्षमत्वं'-ग. 11. 'दस्ति'-क-ख. 12. नालंकृति'-ख, 'सोऽलंकृति'-ग. 13. यत्र-MB. 14. 'भिदधातु'-ग, विदधाति-MB. 15. = वृत्तिमाहुः-MB. 16. गुणवृत्त्या-घ. 17. 'मनाक्स्पृष्टो लक्ष्यत इति'-घ. मनाक्स्पृष्टो संलभ्यते-MB

केचित्पुनः लक्षणकरणशालीनबुद्धयो[1] ध्वनेस्तत्त्वं गिरामगोचरं सहृदयहृदयसंवेद्यमेव समाख्यातवन्तः ।

तेनैवंविधासु[2] विमतिषु स्थितासु सहृदयमनःप्रीतये तत्स्वरूपं ब्रूमः ।

तस्य हि ध्वनेः स्वरूपं सकलसत्कविकाव्योपनिषद्भूतमति-रमणीयमणीयसीभिरपि[3] चिरन्तनकाव्यलक्षणविधायिनां बुद्धिभिरनु-न्मीलितपूर्वम्, अथ च रामायणमहाभारतप्रभुतिनि[4] लक्ष्ये सर्वत्र प्रसिद्ध-व्यवहारं लक्षयतां सहृदयानामानन्दो मनसि लभतां प्रतिष्ठामिति प्रकाश्यते ।

तत्र ध्वनेरेव[5] लक्षयितुमारब्धस्य भूमिकां रचयितुमिदमुच्यते-

**योऽर्थः[6] सहृदयश्लाध्यः काव्यात्मेति[7] व्यवस्थितः ।**
**वाच्यप्रतीयमानाख्यौ तस्य भेदावुभौ स्मृतौ ।। २ ।।**

काव्यस्य हि ललितोचितसन्निवेशचारुणः शरीरस्येवात्मा साररूपतया स्थितः[8] सहृदयश्लाध्यो योऽर्थस्तस्य[9] वाच्यः प्रतीयमानश्चेति द्वौ भेदौ ।

**तत्र वाच्यः प्रसिद्धो यः प्रकारैरुपमादिभिः ।**
**बहुधा व्याकृतः सोऽन्यैः**
काव्यलक्ष्मविधायिभिः[10]
**ततो[11] नेह प्रतन्यते ।। ३ ।।**
केवलमनूद्यते यथोपयोगमिति ।

---

1. करण omitted in MB. 2. विधासु तिसृषु-MB. 3. रमणीयं मनीषिभिरापि–MB.; अपि omitted in घ. 4. प्रभृति–MB. 5. पुनर्ध्व-नेरवे–घ. 6. अर्थः ध, KLV. 7. त्मा तो–घ, KLV. 8. 'स्मृतः'क-ख. 9. 'अ' क-ख. 10. धायिभिः भट्टोद्भटप्रभृतिभिः-MB. 11. भट्टोद्भट-प्रभतिभिस्ततो'-ग.

**प्रतीयमानं पुनरन्यदेव वस्त्वस्ति वाणीषु महाकवीनाम् ।**
**यत्तत्प्रसिद्धावयवातिरिक्तं विभाति[1] लावण्य–**
**मिवाङ्गनासु ।। ४ ।।**

प्रतीयमानं पुनरन्यदेव वाच्याद्वस्त्वस्ति वाणिषु महाकवीनाम् । यत्तत्सहृदयसुप्रसिद्धं[2] प्रसिद्धेभ्योऽलङ्कृतेभ्यः प्रतीतेभ्यो वावयवेभ्यो[3] व्यतिरिक्तत्वेन प्रकाशते लावण्यमिवाङ्गनासु । यथा ह्यङ्गनासु लावण्यं पृथङ्निर्वर्ण्यमानं[4] निखिलावयवव्यतिरेकि किमप्यन्यदेव सहृदयलोचनामृतं तत्त्वान्तरं तद्वदेव सोऽर्थः ।

स ह्यर्थो वाच्यसामर्थ्याक्षिप्तं वस्तुमात्रमलङ्कारा[5] रसादय–श्चेत्यनेकप्रभेदप्रभिन्नो[6] दर्शयिष्यते । सर्वेषु च तेषु[7] तस्य वाच्या–दन्यत्वम् । तथा ह्याद्यस्तावत्प्रभेदो वाच्याद्दूरं विभेदवान्[8] । स हि कदाचिद्वाच्ये विधिरूपे प्रतिषेधरूपः । यथा— .

भम घम्मिअ वीसत्थो सो सुणओ अज्ज मारिओ देण ।
गोलाणईकच्छकुडङ्गवासिणा दरिअसीहेण ।।
[भ्रम धार्मिक विश्वस्तः स शुनकोऽद्य मारितस्तेन ।
गोदानदीकूललताकुञ्जवासिना दृप्तसिंहेन ।। इति च्छाया]

कदाचिद्वाच्ये[9] प्रतिषेधरूपे विधिरूपो[10] यथा–

अत्ता एत्थ णिमज्जइ एत्थ अहं दिअसअं पलोएहि ।
मा पहिअ रत्तिअन्धअ सेज्जाए मह णिमज्जहिसि[11] ।।
[श्वश्रूरत्र निमज्जति अत्राहं दिवसकं प्रलोकय ।
मा पथिक रात्र्यन्धक शय्यायामावयोर्माङ्क्षीः ।। इति च्छाया]

---

1. 'आभाति'-ग, MB, KLV. 2. 'यत्तत्सहृदयहृदयसुप्रसिद्धं'–घ. 3. 'चावयवेभ्यः'–ख. 4. 'अपृथक्पृथङ्निर्वर्ण्यमा'–ग. 5. अलंकाररसादय–BP. 6. प्रकार-MB. 7. प्रकारेषु omitted in MB. 8. 'दूरप्रविभेदवान्'-ग. 9. 'क्वचिद्वाच्ये'-घ.; BP. 10. क्वचित्प्रतिषेधे विधिरूपो-घ. foot notes. 11. महँण-घ.

क्वचिद्वाच्ये विधिरूपेऽनुभयरूपो यथा–

वच्च मह व्विअ एक्केइ हीन्तु णीसासरोइअव्वाइं ।
मा तुज्ज वि तीअ विणा दक्खिण[1]हअस्स जाअन्तु ।।

[व्रज ममैवैकस्या भवन्तु निःश्वासरोदितव्यानि ।
मा तवापि तया विना दाक्षिण्यहतस्य जनिषत ।। इति च्छाया]

क्वचिद्वाच्ये प्रतिषेधरूपेऽनुभयरूपो यथा–

दे आ पसिआ णिवत्तभु मुहससिजोह्लाविलुत्ततमणिवहे[2] ।
अहिसारिआणँ विग्घं करोसि अण्णाणं वि ह आसे ।।
[प्रार्थये तावत्प्रसीद निवर्तस्व मुखशशिज्योत्स्नाविलुप्त–
तमोनिवहे ।
अभिसारिकाणां विघ्नं करोष्यन्यासामपि हताशे ।। इति च्छाया]

क्वचिद्वाच्याद्विभिन्नविषयत्वेन व्यवस्थापितो यथा–

कस्स व ण होइ रोसो दट्ठूण पिआएँ सव्वणं अहरम् ।
सभमरप[3]उमग्घाइणि वरिअवामे सहसु एह्लिम् ।
[कस्य वा न भवति रोषो दृष्ट्वा प्रियायाः सव्रणमधरम् ।
सभ्रमरपद्माघ्रायिणि वारितवामे सहस्वेदानीम् ।। इति च्छाया]

अन्ये चैवंप्रकारा[4] वाच्याद्विभेदिनः[5] प्रतीयमानभेदः सम्भवन्ति । तेषां दिङ्मात्रमेतत्प्रदर्शितम् ।

द्वितियोऽपि प्रभेदो वाच्याद्विभिन्नः सप्रपञ्चमग्रे दर्शयिष्यते ।

तृतीयस्तु रसादिलक्षणः प्रभेदो वाच्यसामर्थ्याक्षिप्तः प्रकाशते,[6] न तु साक्षाच्छब्दव्यापारविषय इति वाच्यद्विभिन्न एव । तथा हि वाच्यत्वं तस्य स्व[7]शब्दनिवेदितत्वेन वा स्यात्, विभावादिप्रतिपादन–मुखेन वा । पूर्वस्मिन्पक्षे स्वशब्दनिवेदितत्वाभावे रसादीनामप्रतीति–प्रसङ्गः । न च सर्वत्र तेषाँ स्वशब्दनिवेदितत्वम् । यत्राप्यस्ति[8] तत्[9],

---

1. दक्खिणण-घ., BP.  2. 'तमोणिवहे'-ख, ग.  3. उपमग्घा-घ.
4. 'चैवंविधाः प्रकारा'-घ.  5. 'क्वचिद्वाच्याद्-ग.  6. 'प्रकाश्यते'-क-ख.
7. 'स्व'क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति.  8. 'निवेद्यत्वम् । यत्रापि वास्ति'–क–ख.
9. तत्–ध पुस्तके नास्ति.

तत्रापि विशिष्टविभावादिप्रतिपादनमुखेनैवैषां[1] प्रतीति[2]। स्वशब्देन सा[3] केवलमनूद्यते, न तु तत्कृता। विषयान्तरे तथा[4] तस्या अदर्शनात्[5]। न हि केवलश्शृङ्गारादिशब्दमात्रभाजि विभावादि–प्रतिपादनरहिते काव्ये मनागपि रसवत्त्वप्रतीतिरस्ति। यतश्च स्वाभि–धानमन्तरेणकेवलेभ्योऽपि विभावादिभ्यो विशिष्टेभ्यो[6] रसादीनां प्रतीतिः, केवलाच्च स्वाभिधानादप्रतीतिः[7], तस्मादन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्या–मभिधेयसामर्थ्याक्षिप्तत्वमेव रसादीनाम्, न त्वभिधेयत्वं कथञ्चिदिति तृतीयोऽपि प्रभेदो वाच्याद्भिन्न एवेति स्थितम्। वाच्येन त्वस्य सहेव[8] प्रतीतिरित्यग्रे दर्शयिष्यते[9]।

**काव्यस्यात्मा स एवार्थस्तथा चादिकवेः पुरा।**
**क्रौञ्चद्वन्द्ववियोगोत्थः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः ॥ ५ ॥**

विविध[10]वाच्यवाचकरचनाप्रपञ्च[11]चारुणः काव्यस्य स एवार्थः सारभूतः। तथा चादिकवेर्वाल्मीकेस्सन्निहितसहचरीविरहकातर–क्रौञ्चाक्रन्दजनितः[12] शोक एव श्लोकतया परिणतः[13]। शोको हि करुणस्थायिभावः[14]। प्रतीयमानस्य[15] चान्यभेददर्शनेऽपि[16] रसभाव–मुखेनैवोपलक्षणं, प्राधान्यात्।

---

1. मुखेन तेषां-MB. 2. 'अप्रतीति'-ग. 3. 'स'क-ख-पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 4. 'तथा' ग–पुस्तके नास्ति. 5. 'दर्शनात्'–ग. 6. विशिष्टेभ्यो' ग–पुस्तके नास्ति. 7. 'स्वाभिधानामात्राद्'–क–ख. 8. सहैव–घ. 9. प्रदर्शयिष्यते'-ग. 10. विविध–विशिष्ठवाच्य'–घ. 11. 'प्रपञ्च' क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. Also not found in the citation made in KLV. p. lll. 12. निहतसहचरी–BP.; निहित. MB. 13. After this व cites the verse :

"मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठांत्वमगमः शाश्वतीः समाः।
यत्क्रौञ्चमिथुनादेकमवधीः काममोहितम् ॥"

14. 'करुणरसे'–घ. 15. प्रतीयमानरूप एवेति प्रतिपादितम् (घ). 16. प्रभेद (घ).

**सरस्वती स्वादु तदर्थवस्तु निःष्यन्दमाना महतां कवीनाम् ।**
**अलोकसामान्यमभिव्यनक्ति[1] परिस्फुरन्तं[2]**
**प्रतिभाविशेषम् ॥ ६ ॥**

तत्[3] वस्तुतत्त्वं[4] निःष्यन्दमाना महतां कवीनां भारती[5] अलोक-सामान्यं प्रतिभाविशेषं परिस्फुरन्तमभिव्यनक्ति । येनास्मिन्नति-विचित्रकविपरम्परावाहिनि[6] संसारे कालिदासप्रभृतयो द्वित्राः पञ्चषा वा महाकवय इति[7] गण्यन्ते ।

इदं चापरं प्रतीयमानस्यार्थस्य सद्भावसाधनं प्रमाणम्—
**शब्दार्थशासनज्ञानमात्रेणैव न वेद्यते ।**
**वेद्यते स तु[8] काव्यार्थतत्त्वज्ञैरेव केवलम् ॥ ७ ॥**

शब्दार्थशासनज्ञानमात्रेऽपि परैर्न वेद्यते सोऽर्थो[9] यस्मात्केवलं काव्यार्थतत्त्वज्ञैरेव ज्ञायते । यदि च[10] वाच्यरूप एवासावर्थः[11] स्या[12]त्तद्-वाच्यवाचकरूप[13]परिज्ञानादेव तत्प्रतीतिः स्यात् । अथ च वाच्यवाचक-लक्षणमात्रकृतश्रमाणां काव्यतत्त्वार्थभावनाविमुखानां[14] स्वरश्रुत्यादि-लक्षण[15]मिवाऽप्रगीतानां[16] गान्धर्वलक्षणविदामगोचर एवासावर्थः ।

एवं वाच्यव्यतिरेकिणो व्यङ्ग्यस्य[17] सद्भावं प्रतिपाद्य प्राधान्यं तस्यैवेति दर्शयति[18]—
**सोऽर्थस्तद्व्यक्तिसामर्थ्ययोगी शब्दश्च कश्चन ।**
**यत्नतः प्रत्यभिज्ञेयौ तौ शब्दार्थौ महाकवेः ॥ ८ ॥**

---

1. 'अवलोकसाम्यं प्रतिभाविशेषं परिस्फुरन्तं समभिव्यनाक्ति'—क-ख. 2. प्रति-स्फुरन्तं-घ. 3. तत् घ पुस्तके नास्ति. 4. 'वस्तुतत्त्वं' इत्यारभ्य 'व्यनक्ति' इति पर्यन्तं क-ख—पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 5. सरस्वती-घ. 6. 'त्रियति' क-ख. 7. 'इति'—ग-पुस्तके नास्ति. 8. 'हि'-घ, KLV. 9. 'शब्दार्थशासनज्ञानमात्रेऽपि परं न वेद्यते सोऽर्थो-घ. 10. 'च' क-ख-पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 11. 'एवास्यार्थः'—ग. 12. 'तत्' क—पुस्तके नास्ति. 13. 'तद्वाचकरूप'—ग. वाचकस्वरूप-घ. 14. 'काव्यार्थतत्त्व' क—ख. 15. 'स्वलक्षण'—ग. 16. मित्र प्रगीतानां—घ. 17. 'व्यङ्ग्यस्यार्थस्य'—ग. 18. 'प्रतिपादयति'—घ., 'प्रदर्शयति'-ग.

स[1] व्यङ्ग्योऽर्थस्तद्व्यक्तिसामर्थ्ययोगी[2] शब्दश्च कश्चन, न सर्वः,[3] तावेव शब्दार्थौ महाकवेः प्रत्यभिज्ञेयौ। व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकाभ्यामेव हि सुप्रयुक्ताभ्यां महाकवित्वलाभो महाकवीनां, न वाच्यवाचकरचनामात्रेण।

इदानीं व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकयोः प्राधान्येऽपि यद्वाच्यवाचकावेव प्रथममुपाददते कवयस्तदपि युक्तमेवेत्याह—

**आलोकर्थी यदा दीपशिखायां यत्नवाञ्जनः।**
**तदुपायतया तद्वदर्थे वाच्ये[4] तदादृतः ॥ ९ ॥**

यथा ह्यालोकार्थी सन्नपि दीपशिखायां यत्नवाञ्जनो[5] भवति तदुपायतया। न हि दीपशिखामन्तरेणालोकः सम्भवति। तद्वद्व्यङ्ग्यमर्थं प्रत्यादृतो जनो वा[6]च्येऽर्थे यत्नवान् भवति। अनेन प्र[7]तिपादकस्य कवेर्व्यङ्ग्यमर्थं[8] प्रति व्यापारो दर्शितः।

प्रतिपाद्यस्यापि तं दर्शयितुमाह—

**यथा पदार्थद्वारेण वाक्यार्थः सम्प्रतीयते।**
**वाच्यार्थपूर्विका तद्वत्प्र[9]तिपत्तस्य वस्तुनः ॥ १० ॥**

यथा हि[10] पदार्थद्वारेण वाक्यार्थावगमस्तथा[11] वाच्यार्थप्रतीतिपूर्विका व्यङ्ग्यस्यार्थस्य प्रतिपत्तिः।

इदानीं वाच्यार्थप्रतीतिपूर्वकत्वेऽपि तत्प्रतीतेर्व्यङ्ग्यस्यार्थस्य प्राधान्यं यथा न व्यालुप्यते[12] तथा दर्शयति—

---

1. 'स' not found in BP. 2. 'अर्थस्तत्प्रकाशनसामर्थ्ययोगी'–घ. 3. न शब्दमात्रम्–ग, BP. 4. 'अर्थो वाच्यो'–ग., 'वाच्यो प्रति तमादृतः' No. (BORI) 5. 'जनो' क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 6. 'वाच्यार्थे'–ख. 7. 'प्रतिपादिकस्य'–ख. 8. 'अर्थे' क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 9. 'प्रतिपन्नस्य'–क–ख; प्रतिपत्तव्य–घ. 10. 'हि' क–ख पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 11. 'वाक्यार्थस्यावगमः' ग. 12. व्यालुप्येत'–घ. विलुप्यते No. 254 (BORI).

**स्वसामर्थ्यवशेनैव वाक्यार्थं प्रथयन्नपि[1] ।**
**यथा व्यापारनिष्पत्तौ पदार्थो न विभाव्यते ।। ११ ।।**

यथा स्वसामर्थ्यवशेनैव वाक्यार्थं प्रकाशयन्नपि पदार्थो व्यापार-निष्पत्तौ न विभाव्यते विभक्ततया —

**तद्वत्सचेतसां सोऽर्थो वाच्यार्थविमुखात्मनाम् ।**
**बुद्धौ तत्त्वार्थदर्शिन्यां झटि[2]त्येवावभासते ।। १२ ।।[3]**

एवं वाच्यव्यतिरेकिणो व्यङ्ग्यस्यार्थस्य सद्भावं प्रतिपाद्य प्रकृत उपयोजयन्नाह[4]—

**यत्रार्थः शब्दो व तमर्थमुपसर्जनीकृतस्वार्थौ ।**
**व्यङ्क्तः काव्यविशेषः स ध्वनिरिति सूरिभिः कथितः ।। १३ ।।**

यत्रार्थो वाच्यविशेषः[5] शब्दो वा तमर्थं व्यङ्क्तः स काव्यविशेषो ध्वनिरिति । अनेन वाच्यवाचकचारुत्वहेतुभ्य उपमादिभ्योऽनुप्रासा-दीभ्यश्च विभक्त एव ध्वनेर्विषय इति दर्शितम् ।

यदप्युक्तम् — 'प्रसिद्धप्रस्थानातिक्रमिणो मार्गस्य काव्यत्व-हानेर्ध्वनिर्नास्ति' इति तदुपयुक्तम् । यतो लक्षणकृतामेव स केवलं न प्रसिद्धः, लक्ष्ये तु परीक्ष्यमाणे स एव सहृदयाह्लादकारि[6] काव्यतत्त्वम् । ततोऽन्यच्चित्रमेवे[7]त्यग्रे दर्शयिष्यामः ।

---

1. प्रतिपादयन्–BP & KSS. Editions. 2. 'झगिति'–ख, KLV. 3. यत्रा(न्ना)वभासते । (?) इति घ पुस्तके वृत्तावधिकः । यत्रावभासते No. 254 (BGRI). 4. प्रकृते ध्वनिलक्षणे उपयोगं गमयन्नाह–KLV. 5. 'वाचकविशेषः' क–ख पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 6. सहृदयाह्लादि काव्यम्. क–ख. 7. 'एव' क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति.

यदप्युक्तम्[1] कामनीयकमनतिवर्तमानस्य [2]तस्योक्तालङ्कारादिप्रकारेष्वन्तर्भावः इति, तदप्यसमीचीनम्; यतो वाच्यवाचकमात्राश्रयिणि प्रस्थाने व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकसमाश्रयेण व्यवस्थितस्य ध्वनेः कथमन्तर्भावः, वाच्यवाचकचारुत्वहेतवो हि[3] तस्याङ्गभूताः, न तु तदेकरूपा एवेति प्रतिपादयिष्यमाणत्वात्[4]।

परिकरश्लोकश्चात्र–
'व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकसंबन्धनिबन्धनतया ध्वनेः।
वाच्यवाचकचारुत्वहेत्वन्तःपातिता कुतः ॥'

ननु यत्र प्रतीयमानस्यार्थस्य[5] वैशद्येनाप्रतीतिः स नाम मा भूद्ध्वनेर्विषयः। यत्र तु [6]तत्प्रतीतिरस्ति, यथा समासोक्त्याक्षेपानुक्तनिमित्तविशेषोक्ति[7]पर्यायोक्तापह्नुतिदीपकसङ्करा[8]लङ्कारादौ, तत्र[9] ध्वनेरन्तर्भावो भविष्यतीत्यादि निराकर्तुमभिहितम् — 'उपसर्जनीकृतस्वार्थौ' इति। अर्थो गुणीकृतात्मा, गुणीकृताभिधेयः[10] शब्दो वा यत्रार्थान्तरमभिव्यनक्ति स ध्वनिरिति। तेषु कथं तस्यान्तर्भावः। व्यङ्ग्यप्राधान्ये हि ध्वनिः। न चैतत्समासोक्त्यादिष्वस्ति। समासोक्तौ तावत् —

उपोढरागेण विलोलतारकं तथा गृहीतं शशिना निशामुखम्।
यथा समस्तं तिमिरंशुकं तथा पुरोऽपि[11] रागाद्गलितं
न लक्षितम् ॥

---

1. 'उदितं'-ग. 2. तस्योक्तेष्वेव काव्यशोभाहेतुष्वन्तर्भावः–M.B. 3. 'हि' क-ख. पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 4. प्रतिपिपादयिष्यमाणत्वात्–घ. 5. 'अप्यर्थस्य'–ग. 6. तत्–omitted BP. 7. 'पर्यायापह्नुति'–ग. 8. 'सङ्करादौ'–ग., सङ्करालङ्काराप्रस्तुतप्रशंसादौ–MB. 9. 'तत्र तत्र'–ग. 10. भिधेयश्च–घ. 11. 'पूरोविरागात्'–ग.

इत्यादौ व्यङ्ग्येनानुगतं वाच्यमेव[1] प्राधान्येन प्रतीयते, समारोपितनायिकानायकव्यवहारयोर्निशाशशिनोरेव वाक्यार्थत्वात् ।

आक्षेपेऽ[2]पि व्यङ्ग्यविशेषाक्षेपिणो वाच्यस्यैव चारुत्वं प्राधान्येन [3]वाक्यार्थ आक्षेपोक्तिसामर्थ्यादेव ज्ञायते । तथाहि [4]तत्र शब्दोप[5]रूढो विशेषाभिधानेच्छया प्रतिषेधरूपो य आक्षेपः स एव व्यङ्ग्यविशेषमक्षिपन्मुख्यं काव्यशरीरम् । चारुत्वोत्कर्षनिबन्धना[6] हि वाच्यव्यङ्ग्ययोः प्राधान्यविवक्षा । यथा—

अनुरागवती सन्ध्या दिवसस्तत्पुरस्सरः ।
अहो दैवगतिश्चित्रा[7] तथापि न समागमः ।।

अत्र सत्यामपि व्यङ्ग्यप्रतीतौ वाच्यस्यैव चारुत्वमुत्कर्षवदिति तस्यैव प्राधान्यविवक्षा ।

यथा च दीपकापह्नुत्यादौ व्यङ्ग्यत्वेनोपमायाः प्रतीतावपि प्राधान्येनाविवक्षितत्वान्न तया व्यपदेशस्तद्वदत्रापि द्रष्टव्यम् । अनुक्तनिमित्तायामपि विशेषोक्तौ—

आहूतोऽपि सहायैरोमित्युक्त्वा[8] विमुक्तनिद्रोऽपि ।
गन्तुमना अपि पथिकः सङ्कोचं नैव शिथिलयति ।।

इत्यादौ व्यङ्ग्यस्य प्रकरणसामर्थ्यात्प्रतीतिमात्रम् । न तु तत्प्र[9]तीतिनिमित्ता काचिच्चारुत्वनिष्पत्तिरिति न प्राधान्यम् ।

---

1. 'एव'–क-ख पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 2. 'हि'–क-ख. 3. 'वाच्यार्थ'–ग.; काव्यार्थ No. (BORI). 4. 'तथाहि तत्र हि'–ग. 5. शब्दोपारूढरूपो–घ. 6. 'निबन्धनाभिदा'–ग. 7. कीदृक् BP. 8. 'सहायैरेमीत्युक्त्वा'–घ. 9. 'तत्' क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति.

पर्यायोक्तेऽपि यदि प्राधान्येन व्यङ्ग्यत्वं तद्भवतु ना[1]म तस्य ध्वनावन्तर्भावः। न तु ध्वनेस्तत्रान्तर्भावः। तस्य महाविषयत्वेनाङ्गित्वेन च प्रतिपादयिष्[2]यमाणत्वात्। न पुनः पर्यायोक्ते भामहोदाहृतसदृशे व्यङ्ग्यस्यैव प्राधान्यम् वाच्यस्य तत्रोपसर्जनीभावेनाविवक्षितत्वात्।

अपह्नुतिदीपकयोः पुनर्वाच्यस्य प्राधान्यं व्यङ्ग्यस्य चा[3]नुयायित्वं प्रसिद्धमेव।

सङ्करालङ्कारेऽपि यदालङ्कारोऽलङ्कारान्तरच्छायामनुगृह्णाति, तदा व्यङ्ग्यस्य प्राधान्येनाविवक्षितत्वान्न ध्वनिविषयत्वम्। अलङ्कारद्वयसम्भावनायां तु वाच्यव्यङ्ग्ययोः समं प्राधान्यम्। अथ वाच्योपसर्जनीभावेन व्यङ्ग्यस्य तत्रावस्थानं[4] तदा सोऽपि ध्वनिविषयोऽस्तु, न तु स एव ध्वनिरिति वक्तुं शक्यम्। पर्यायोक्तनिर्दिष्टन्यायात्। अपि च सङ्करालङ्कारस्य क्वचित् सङ्करोक्तिरेव ध्वनिसंभावनां निराकरोति[5]।

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसायामपि यदा सामान्यविशेषभावान्निमित्तनिमित्तिभावाद्वा अ[6]भिधीयमानस्याप्रस्तुतस्य प्रतीयमानेन प्रस्तुतेनाभिसम्बन्धः तदाभिधीयमानप्रतीयमानयोः सममेव प्राधान्यम्। यदा तावत्सामान्यस्याप्रस्तुतस्याभिधीयमानस्य प्राकरणिकेन विशेषेण[7] प्रतीयमानेन सम्बन्धस्तदा विशेषप्रतीतौ सत्यामपि[8] प्राधान्येन तस्य सामान्येनाविना[9]भावात्सामान्यस्यापि प्राधान्यम्। यदापि विशेषस्य सामान्यनिष्ठत्वं तदापि सामान्यस्य प्रा[10]धान्ये सामान्ये सर्वविशेषा[11]णामन्तर्भावाद्विशेषस्यापि प्राधान्यम्। निमित्तनिमित्तिभावे चायमेव न्यायः।

---

1. 'नाम'–ग. पुस्तके नास्ति. 2. प्रतिपिपादयिष्यमाणत्वात्–घ. 3. 'च'–च–पुस्तके नास्ति. 4. 'तत्रापि व्यवस्थानं'–घ. 5. अपि च सङ्करालङ्कारस्य सङ्करोक्तिरेव ध्वनिसंभावनां करोति–घ. 6. अभिधीयमानस्य इत्यारभ्य अभिधीयमान इति पर्यन्तं–घ–पुस्तके नास्ति. 7. 'विशेषणेन.'–ख. 8. 'सत्यां'–ग–पुस्तके नास्ति. 9. 'विनाभावात्'–क–ख. 10. 'प्राधान्येन'–क–ख. 11. 'विशेषणानां'–क–ख.

यदा तु सारूप्यमात्र[1]वशेनाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसायामप्रकृतप्रकृतयोः सम्बन्धस्तदा-प्यप्रस्तुतस्य सरूपस्याभिधीयमानस्य प्रा[2]धान्येनाविवक्षायां ध्वनावेवा-न्तर्भावः इतरथात्वलङ्कारान्तरत्वमेव । तदयमत्र संक्षेपः—

(१) 'व्यङ्ग्यस्य यत्राप्राधान्यं वाच्यमात्रानुयायिनः ।
समासोक्त्यादयस्तत्र वाच्यालङ्कृतयः स्फुटाः ।।

(२) व्यङ्ग्यस्य प्रतिभामात्रे वाच्यार्थानुगमेऽपि वा ।
न ध्वनिर्यत्र वा तस्य प्राधान्यं न प्रतीयते ।।

(३) तत्परावेव शब्दार्थौ यत्र व्यङ्ग्यं प्रति स्थितौ ।
ध्वनेः स एव विषयो मन्तव्यः सङ्करोज्झितः ।।[3]

तस्मान्न ध्वनेरन्यत्रान्तर्भावः ।

इतश्च नान्तर्भावः; यतः काव्यविशेषोऽङ्गी ध्वनिरिति कथितः। तस्य पुनरङ्गानि—[4]अलङ्कारा गुणा वृत्तयश्चेति प्रतिपादयिष्यते । न चावयव एव पृथग्भूतोऽवयवीति प्रसिद्धः । अपृथग्भावे तु तदङ्गत्वं तस्य न तु तत्त्वमेव । यत्रापि वा तत्त्वं तत्रापि ध्वनेर्महाविषयत्वान्न[5] तन्निष्ठत्वमेव ।

'सूरिभिः कथित' इति विद्वदुपज्ञेयमुक्तिः, न तु यथाकथञ्चित्-प्रवृत्तेति [6]प्रतिपाद्यते । प्रथमे हि विद्वांसो वैयाकरणाः, व्याकरण-मूलत्वात्सर्वविद्यानाम् । ते[7] च श्रूयमाणेषु वर्णेषु ध्वनिरिति व्य[8]वहरन्ति । [9]तथैवान्यैस्तन्मतानुसारिभिः सूरिभिः काव्यतत्त्वार्थ-

1. 'वशेनान्यस्य'–क–ख. 2. 'प्राधान्यस्य'–क–ख. 3. These three–परिकरश्लोकs have–been printed as कारिकाs in N. S. P. edn.
4. 'अलंकारो'–क–ख. 5. 'न'–क–ख–पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 6. 'प्रकाश्यते'–ग.
7. 'तेषु श्रूय'–क–ख. 8. 'व्याहरन्ति'–ख. 9. 'तथैवान्यैः' इत्यारभ्य 'आविष्करणीयम्' इत्यन्तं क–ख–पुस्तकयोः नास्ति.

र्दशिभिर्वाच्यवाचकसम्मिश्रः शब्दात्मा काव्यमिति व्यपदेश्यो व्यञ्जकत्वसाम्याद्ध्वनिरित्युक्तः। न चैवंविधस्य ध्वनेर्वक्ष्यमाणप्रभेदतद्भेदसङ्कलनया महाविषयस्य यत्प्रकाशनं तदप्र[1]सिद्धालङ्कारविशेषमात्रप्रतिपादनेन तुल्यमिति तद्भावित चेतसां युक्त एव संरम्भः। न च तेषु कथञ्चिदीर्ष्यया कलुषितशेमुषीकत्वमाविष्करणीयम्।

तदेवं ध्वनेस्तावदभाववादिनः प्रत्युक्ताः। अस्ति ध्वनिः।

स चासावविवक्षितवाच्यो विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्यश्चेति द्विविधः सामान्येन। तत्राद्यस्योदाहरणम्—

सुवर्णपुष्पां पृथिवीं चिन्वन्ति पुरुषास्त्रयः।
शूरश्च कृतविद्यश्च यश्च जानाति सेवितुम्॥

द्वितीयस्यापि—

शिखरिणि क्व नु नाम कियच्चिरं किमभिधानमसावकरोत्तपः।
तरुणि येन तवाधरपाटलं दशति बिम्बफलं शुकशावकः॥

यदप्युक्तं भक्तिर्ध्वनिरिति तत्प्रतिसमाधार्यते—

**भक्त्या बिभर्ति नैकत्वं रूपभेदादयं ध्वनिः।**

अयमुक्तप्रकारो ध्वनिर्भक्त्या नैक[2]त्वं बिभर्ति, भिन्नरूपत्वात्। वाच्यव्यतिरिक्तस्यार्थस्य वाच्यवाचकाभ्यां तात्पर्येण प्रका[3]शनं यत्र व्य[4]ङ्ग्यप्राधान्ये स ध्वनिः। उपचारमात्रं तु[5] भक्तिः।

1. 'तदत्र'–घ. 2. 'नैकतां'–ग. अर्थप्रकाशनं–घ. 4. 'व्यङ्ग्यप्राधान्ये' –क–ख पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति. 5. 'तु'–क–ख पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति.

मा[1] चैतत्स्याद्भक्तिर्लक्षणं ध्वनेरित्याह—

**अतिव्याप्तेरथाव्याप्तेर्न चासौ लक्ष्यते तया ॥ १४ ॥**

नैव[2] भक्त्या ध्वनिर्लक्ष्यते । कथम् अतिव्याप्तेरव्याप्तेश्च । तत्रापिव्याप्तिर्ध्वनिव्यतिरिक्तेऽ[3]पि विषये भक्तेः सम्भवात् यत्र हि व्य[4]ञ्जकत्वकृतं महत्सौष्ठवं नास्ति तत्राप्युपचरितशब्दवृत्त्या प्रसिद्धय-नुरोधप्रवर्तितव्यवहाराः कवयो दृश्यन्ते । यथा—

परिम्लानं पीनस्तनजघनसङ्गातुभयत-
स्तनोर्मध्यस्यान्तः प[5]रिमिलनमप्राप्य हरितम् ।
इदं व्यस्तन्यासं श्ल[6]थभुजलताक्षेपवलनैः
कृशाङ्ग्याः सन्तापं वदति बिसिनीपत्रशयनम् ॥

तथा[7]—

चुम्बिज्जइ सअ[8]हुत्तं अवरुन्धिज्जइ सहस्सहुत्तं वि ।
रमिअ पुणो वि रमिज्जइ पिए जणे णत्थि पुणरुत्तम् ॥
[ चुम्ब्यते शतकृत्वोऽवरुध्यते सहस्रकृत्वः ।
रन्त्वा पुनरपि रम्यते प्रिये जने[9] नास्ति पुनरुक्तम् ॥
इति च्छाया ]

तथा[10]—

कुविआवो पसण्णाओ ओरण्णमुहीओ विहसमाणाओ ।
जह गहिआ तह हिअअं हरन्ति उच्छिन्तमहिलाओ ॥
[ कुपिताः प्रसन्ना अवरुदितवदना विहसन्त्यः ।
यथा गृहीतास्तथा हृदयं हरन्ति स्वैरिण्यो महिलाः ॥
इति च्छाया ]

---

1. 'तत्रैतत्स्याद्भक्तिर्लक्षणं'—घ, KLV ननु मा भूद्भक्तिर्ध्वनिरिति चैकं रूपं, भवतु भक्तिर्ध्वनेर्लक्षणमित्याह—MB. 2. 'न च'—घ, KLV. 3. 'च'—ग. 4. 'व्यङ्ग्यकृतं'—BP. 5. 'परिमलनमप्राप्य'—घ. 6. 'प्रशिथिलभुजाक्षेप'—घ. 7. 'यथा'—ग. 8. असहुत्तं BP. 9. प्रियो जनो—घ. BP. 10. 'यथा',—ग.

तथा—

अज्जाएँ पहारो णवलदाए दिण्णो पिएण थणवट्टे ।
मिउओ वि दूसहो व्विअ जाओ हिअए सवत्तीणम् ।।
[ भार्याया प्रहारो नवलतया दत्तः प्रियेण स्तनपृष्ठे ।
मृदुकोऽपि दुःसह इव जातो हृदये सपत्नीनाम् ।।
इति च्छाया ]

तथा[1]—

परार्थे यः पीडामनुभवति भङ्गे[2]ऽपि मधुरो
यदीयः सर्वेषामिह खलु विकारोऽप्यभिमतः ।
न सम्प्राप्तो वृद्धिं यदि स भृशमक्षेत्रपतितः
किमिक्षोर्दोषो[3]ऽसौ न पुनरगुणाया मरुभुवः ।।

इत्य[4]त्रेक्षुपक्षेऽनुभवतिशब्दः । न चैव[5]विधः कदाचिदपि ध्वनेर्विषयः ।

यतः—

**उक्त्यन्तरेणाश[6]क्यं यत्तच्चारुत्वं प्रकाशयन् ।**
**शब्दो व्यञ्जकतां बिभ्रद्ध्वन्युक्तेर्विषयी भवेत् ।। १५ ।।**

अत्र चोदाहृते विषये नोक्त्य[7]न्तराशक्यचारुत्वव्यक्तिहेतुः शब्दः ।

किञ्च—

**[8]रूढा ये विषयेऽन्यत्र शब्दाः स्वविषयादपि ।**
**लावण्याद्याः प्रयुक्तास्ते न भवन्ति पदं ध्वनेः ।। १६ ।।**

तेषु चोपचरितश[9]ब्दवृत्तिरस्तीति । तथाविधे च विषये क्वचित्सम्भवन्नपि ध्वनिव्यवहारः प्रकारान्तरेण प्रवतते । न तथाविधशब्दमुखेन । अपिच—

**मुख्यां वृत्तिं परित्यज्य गुणवृत्त्यार्थदर्शनम् ।**
**यदुद्दिश्य फलं तत्र शब्दो नैव स्खलद्गतिः ।। १७ ।।**

---

1. 'यथा'—ग. 2. 'च'—ग. 3. 'अयं'—ग. 4. 'इत्यादाविक्षुपदेऽनुभूतिशब्दः'—क—ख; इत्यत्रेक्षुपदेऽनुभूतिशब्दः—घ. 5. 'कदाचिद्ध्वनेर्विषयः । यतः'—क—ख; कदाचिदपि ध्वनेर्विषयोऽभिमतः ।—घ. 6. 'णाशङ्क्यं'—ख. 7. 'नोक्त्यन्तरेणाशक्यं'—क—ख. 8. 'निरूढा'—ग. 9. 'शब्दप्रवृत्ति'—ग.

तत्र[1] हि चारुत्वातिशयविशिष्टार्थप्रकाशनलक्ष[2]णे प्रयोजने कर्तव्ये यदि शब्दस्यामुख्यता तदा तस्य प्रयोगे दुष्टतैव स्यात्। तस्मात्—

**वाचकत्वाश्रयेणैव गुणवृत्तिर्व्यवस्थिता।**
**व्यञ्जकत्वैकमूलस्य ध्वनेः स्याल्लक्षणं कथम् ॥ १८ ॥**

तस्मादन्यो ध्वनिरन्या च गुणवृत्तिः।

अव्याप्तिरप्य[3]स्य लक्षणस्य। न हि ध्वनिप्रभेदो विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्यलक्षणः, अन्ये च बहवः प्र[4]कारा भक्त्या व्याप्यन्ते; तस्माद्भक्तिरलक्षणम्[5]।

**कस्यचिद्ध्वनिभेदस्य सा तु स्यादुपलक्षणम्।**

सा पुनर्भक्तिर्वक्ष्यमाणप्रभेदमध्यादन्यतमस्य भेदस्य यदि नामोपलक्षणतया सम्भाव्यते[6], यदि च गुणवृत्त्यैव ध्वनिर्लक्ष्यत इत्युच्यते, तदभिधाव्यापारेण तदितरोऽलङ्कारवर्गः[7] समग्र एव लक्ष्य[8]त इति प्रत्येकमलङ्काराणां लक्षणकरणवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गः[9]। किं च—

**लक्षणेऽन्यैः कृते चास्य पक्षसंसिद्धिरेव नः ॥ १९ ॥**

कृतेऽपि वा पूर्वमेवान्यैर्ध्वनिलक्षणे पक्षसंसिद्धिरेव नः; यस्माद्ध्वनिरस्तीति नः[10] पक्षः। स च प्रागेव संसिद्ध इत्ययत्नसंपन्नसमीहितार्थाः संवृत्ताः[11] स्मः।

---

1. 'अत्र'–ग. 2. 'लक्षणाप्रयोजने'–ग. 3. अव्याप्तिरस्य'–घ. 4. तद्भेदप्रकारा वक्ष्यमाणा भक्त्या'–ग. 5. 'रलक्षणा' KLV. 6. 'संभाव्येत' BP. 7. 'तदितरालंकार–ग. 8. लक्ष्यति–घ. 9. 'लक्षणकरणे'–घ. 10. 'वादिनः'–क-ख. 11. 'संपन्नाः'–घ.

येऽपि सहृदयसंवेद्यमनाख्येयमेव ध्वनेरात्मानमाम्नासिषुस्तेऽपि न परीक्ष्यवादिनः। यत उक्तया नीत्या वक्ष्यमाणया च ध्वनेः सामान्य-विशेषलक्षणे प्रतिपादितेऽपि यद्यनाख्येयत्वं तत्सर्वेषामेव वस्तूनां प्रसक्त[1]म्। यदि पुनर्ध्वनेरतिशयोक्त्यानया काव्यान्तरातिशायि[2] तैः स्वरूपमाख्यायते तत्तेऽपि युक्ताभिधायिनं एव।

इति [3]श्रीराजानकानन्दवर्धनाचार्यविरचिते सहृदयालोके[4]
प्रथमोद्द्योतः[5] ॥

1. 'तत्प्रसक्तम्' BP. 2. 'अतिशयितं स्वरूपं'–ग. 3. 'श्रीमदानन्द°' –क-ख. 4. सहृदयहृदयालोके–Nepal Ms. 'काव्यालोके'–क, 'सहृदया-लोकनाम्नि काव्यालंकारे'–ग. No Ms gives 'ध्वन्यालोके' 5. 'संकेतः'–ख.

# DHVANYALOKA

Dr. K. GODA VARMA

DEPARTMENT OF MALAYALAM
UNIVERSITY OF KERALA
TRIVANDRUM